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History

- Survey developed by sub-committee fall 2006
- CNS created online survey, PIN, and data management, spring 2007
- Survey invitation emailed to 164 full-time CAS faculty on April 3, 2007
- Reminder emails sent only to non-respondents on April 11, 2007 and April 17, 2007
- Survey closed at midnight April 24, 2007
- Respondents tracked using randomly-generated 5-digit PIN
- PIN was not associated with response data in any way
- 90 unique respondents at survey close (55% response rate)
- Some glitches noted in survey based on question structure, etc., but few complaints logged
Respondents by Length of service
(n=90, 55% response rate)

- under 5 years: 28%
- 5-10 years: 27%
- 11-20 years: 29%
- over 20 years: 17%

Base: Total Respondents = 90
Q1. Importance of roles of the Dept Chair

### Mean and Median Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide vision &amp; leadership</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take turn to serve</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage lim. rescs</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for dept int</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do dept busy work</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent dept.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise/respond to students</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor jr. faculty</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Other” important roles of the dept chair

• anything but busy work
• be cool.
• chair faculty search committees
• Develop curriculum in a holistic way
• fight the dean
• Manage: i.e., coordinate the needs of indiv faculty with the needs of the dept as a whole and the college/university, so that ALL can be more productive
• Shepherd curriculum and facilitate faculty development
Q8. Satisfaction with CURRENT Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 5 years</th>
<th>5 - 10 years</th>
<th>11 - 20 years</th>
<th>Over 20 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Dissatisfied (1/2)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied (4/5)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Dissatisfied (1/2)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied (4/5)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Dissatisfied (1/2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied (4/5)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Dissatisfied (1/2)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied (4/5)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Dissatisfied (1/2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied (4/5)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Dissatisfied (1/2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied (4/5)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=24) (N=15) (N=26) (N=25)
### Q8. Satisfaction with CURRENT Chair, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 5 years</th>
<th>5 - 10 years</th>
<th>11 - 20 years</th>
<th>Over 20 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mgmt</strong></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparent</strong></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising</strong></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rel w/Dean</strong></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=24) (N=15) (N=26) (N=25)
### Q3/4. Relationship between Chairs and Dean?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Type</th>
<th>Q3. CURRENT RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>Q4. IDEAL RELATIONSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial &amp; collaborative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual tolerance of each other's roles</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs facilitate Dean's work</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept as site of work; Dean facilitates</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversarial relationship</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrimonious relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base: Total Respondents**  

90
Q3/4. Relationship between Chairs & Dean

Under 5 years

- **Collegial & Collaborative**
  - Current: 38%
  - Ideal: 83%

- **Mutual tolerance of roles**
  - Current: 50%
  - Ideal: 4%

- **Chairs facilitate Dean’s work**
  - Current: 8%
  - Ideal: 4%

- **Dept as site of work; Dean facilitates**
  - Current: 38%
  - Ideal: 50%

- **Adversarial relationship**
  - Current: 17%
  - Ideal: 8%

- **Acrimonious relationship**
  - Current: 4%
  - Ideal: 4%

(N=24)

5 - 10 years

- **Collegial & Collaborative**
  - Current: 33%
  - Ideal: 80%

- **Mutual tolerance of roles**
  - Current: 47%
  - Ideal: 0%

- **Chairs facilitate Dean’s work**
  - Current: 40%
  - Ideal: 7%

- **Dept as site of work; Dean facilitates**
  - Current: 47%
  - Ideal: 80%

- **Adversarial relationship**
  - Current: 13%
  - Ideal: 0%

- **Acrimonious relationship**
  - Current: 0%
  - Ideal: 0%

(N=15)

11 - 20 years

- **Collegial & Collaborative**
  - Current: 38%
  - Ideal: 92%

- **Mutual tolerance of roles**
  - Current: 54%
  - Ideal: 4%

- **Chairs facilitate Dean’s work**
  - Current: 12%
  - Ideal: 8%

- **Dept as site of work; Dean facilitates**
  - Current: 35%
  - Ideal: 54%

- **Adversarial relationship**
  - Current: 23%
  - Ideal: 0%

- **Acrimonious relationship**
  - Current: 8%
  - Ideal: 0%

(N=26)

Over 20 years

- **Collegial & Collaborative**
  - Current: 8%
  - Ideal: 92%

- **Mutual tolerance of roles**
  - Current: 4%
  - Ideal: 4%

- **Chairs facilitate Dean’s work**
  - Current: 24%
  - Ideal: 12%

- **Dept as site of work; Dean facilitates**
  - Current: 32%
  - Ideal: 72%

- **Adversarial relationship**
  - Current: 40%
  - Ideal: 0%

- **Acrimonious relationship**
  - Current: 8%
  - Ideal: 0%

(N=25)
Relationship between Chairs & Dean

• 2 ½ single-space pages of comments

• 32 separate comments

• Sample of range/type of responses:
Some have concerns....

Concerns related to the Dean:

- Faculty see Dean as "stuck" between faculty and AVP/President -- they don't think that Dean "speaks for him/her self," so don't trust that Dean is ABLE to work in a genuinely collaborative fashion.

- The Dean is autocratic and dictatorial, seeking to violate and overturn constitutional guarantees of faculty governance.

- It's currently hugely variable. The Dean claims to respect departmental decision making, but it often seems like he only accepts departmental decisions when they match his own preferences.
Concerns related to Chairs:

- Our department never hears reports from the dean's meetings unless something has gone horribly wrong or unless we have to do something for the department. Any news goes completely unreported.

- Chairs at Ffd have very little authority, and thus have difficulty entering into a collaborative relationship with the Dean, who has substantial authority.

- The chair feigns collegiality but when he reports back to the department his comments are usually derogatory such that he presents himself as crucial to negotiating departmental needs with the Dean thus creating a somewhat adversarial relationship between the individual members of the department and the Dean with the chair as the knight in shining armour.
Some see things as working well….

• While there are at times natural tensions due to normal conflicts of interests and objective, overall I have found that the relationship at present is healthy.

• Our system can and does work well. When a department does experience governance problems then the Dean should intervene, with the AC, to resolve problems. Strong, independent Chairs are an asset.

• The work of the college is teaching and research. The chairs help their faculty in this work; the dean serves the departments and the faculty respectively.
Q8. Satisfaction with CURRENT Chair

Relationship with the Dean

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels with the Dean.]

- **38%** Extremely Satisfied (5)
- **20%** Very Satisfied (4)
- **23%** Satisfied (3)
- **4%** Somewhat Satisfied (2)
- **15%** Dissatisfied (1)

**Mean:** 3.62
**Median:** 4.00
**Std. Dev.:** 1.40
**N:** 74
Suggestions for Dean & Chairs:

• The Dean should adopt MBWA: Management By Walking Around. Be open and accessible.

• Both Dean and Chairs could have more appreciation for each other's roles and challenges. Dean and Chairs are more collaborative on some tasks than others, and those examples highlight a good balance of adversarial and collegial dynamics.

• Dean must have an open-door policy -- must work WITH people, not merely give top-down orders. There must be transparency to the way the dean develops policy: that is, collegiality and sharing of information. Of course, that only works if the department chairs have any vision for their departments beyond getting more resources.

• Both chairs and the dean should have a strong, clear vision. Both need to be leaders, working in the best interest of the university. There's nothing worse that a dean, chair, or faculty member who acts in self interest.
Q6. Most Appropriate Comp. for Chairs

Stipend Increase Recommendations:
Min: $6,000
Max: $10,000
Avg: $7,583
N = 6

Base: Total Respondents = 90
Q6. Most Appropriate Comp. for Chairs

Choice of stipend OR release time

- Under 5 years: 17% (N=24)
- 5-10 years: 13% (N=15)
- 11-20 years: 12% (N=26)
- Over 20 years: 24% (N=25)

Length of time as faculty member
Q6. Most Appropriate Comp. for Chairs

Combination of stipend AND release time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time as faculty member</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=24, N=15, N=26, N=25
Q6. Most Appropriate Comp. for Chairs

Depends on size, issues, & complexity of dept

- Under 5 years: 13% (N=24)
- 5-10 years: 33% (N=15)
- 11-20 years: 15% (N=26)
- Over 20 years: 12% (N=25)
Q6. Most Appropriate Comp. for Chairs

Chairing is service & should not be compensated

Length of time as faculty member

Under 5 years: 0% (N=24)
5-10 years: 0% (N=15)
11-20 years: 0% (N=26)
Over 20 years: 0% (N=25)
Compensation of Department Chairs

• 2 ½ single-space pages of comments

• 31 separate comments, plus 6 different stipend amounts ($6,000-$10,000)

• Sample of range/type of responses:
Most favor more compensation:

- I don't believe that the chair can provide any kind of leadership and vision for shaping the next period of the department without that course release. The inevitable result is that a chair only handles the busy work and the bare necessities of the job. This hurts the department and the college.

- Currently Business School chairs receive a stipend of $7000 and a course reduction each semester. The university should give CAS chairs this level of compensation.

- I believe the Chair of a Department should be compensated in an amount that is well over $4,500 and that they should in addition have course relief.

- The present system in the CAS is highly problematic and in many ways unfair. There has not been an increase in the stipend for more than a decade, even longer, and the duties have expanded greatly. Also, there is a real inequity in my opinion when the situation for Chairs in the CAS is compared with those in the Dolan School of Business. This is not at all a good situation, is unjust, and very bad for the morale of Chairs in the CAS.
Equity or Equality?

- Inconceivable and inconsiderate that some dept. chairs continue to get a course release while other dept. chairs do not, all at the whim of the academic VP. As long as this continues I will never ever serve as dept. chair.

- A chair of a large department with lots of students should get both stipend and course release. With a smaller department, the chair should be able to choose between a stipend and a course release.

- The stipend is insufficient to compensate for the time and effort spent. I believe also that it is wrong for some departments chairs to get released time, while other department chairs do not have this option. How do these backroom deals get made?

- Stipends should be raised in addition to course releases. Chair has a complex job. I am not opposed to different departments having different arrangements, as some chairs prefer time, others supplemental income, and some departments are more complex and challenging than others. But if there is an uneven remuneration, then it must be subject to regular review, transparent, and based on some kind of clear criteria for differences.
Other Issues:

• You don't want released time because that takes an experienced teacher out of the classroom, and you have to hire an adjunct to cover that class. We already have too many adjuncts.

• Time is the most precious compensation for a chair who remains active as a scholar/participant in his/her discipline. Being a chair in one's professional environment among colleagues from other institutions has its own perks.

• The compensation for the chair is completely out of line with the responsibility in my department. It is too important a job to allow people who will do a poor job the same turn as those who will do it well.

• I strongly oppose the proposal that has been put forward in the past by the dean, AVP, and president (Kelley) that release time would be offered to chairs only if the administration can appoint them.
## Q2. Reasons to serve as Dept Chair

| Reason                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------|-------------|----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------|
| Take turn as eligible       | 43% | 10% | 17% | 6% | 8% | 11% | 2% | 2% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
| Release/Stipend             | 1% | 14% | 12% | 13% | 22% | 13% | 25% | 1% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
| Change course               | 21% | 13% | 18% | 17% | 17% | 15% | 4% | 4% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
| Manage resources            | 4% | 21% | 14% | 17% | 9% | 5% | 8% | 4% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
| Prof. Develop.              | 13% | 22% | 19% | 17% | 9% | 15% | 4% | 1% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
| Power Dynamics              | 4% | 13% | 18% | 9% | 16% | 16% | 6% | 9% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
| By default; no one else     | 9% | 25% | 15% | 14% | 9% | 4% | 1% | 0% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
| Would not serve             | 17% | 3% | 3% | 5% | 5% | 0% | 2% | 6% | Mean: 2.80 | Median: 2.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.03 | N: 88 | Mean: 4.83 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.85 | N: 76 | Mean: 3.75 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.11 | N: 73 | Mean: 4.26 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 1.68 | N: 72 | Mean: 3.69 | Median: 3.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.02 | N: 83 | Mean: 4.74 | Median: 5.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.06 | N: 68 | Mean: 4.27 | Median: 4.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.30 | N: 75 | Mean: 6.20 | Median: 8.00 | Std. Dev.: 2.79 | N: 65 |
Q5. BEST method for selecting Dept Chair

- Dept elects: 52%
- Dean appoints: 0%
- Dept/Dean collaborate: 23%
- Chair rotates: 16%
- Cand. Applies; Dept selects: 8%
- Other: 1%

Base: Total Respondents = 90
Q5. BEST method for selecting Dept Chair

Department should elect the chair

- Under 5 years (N=24): 50%
- 5-10 years (N=15): 53%
- 11-20 years (N=26): 35%
- Over 20 years (N=25): 72%
Q5. BEST method for selecting Dept Chair

Dean should appoint Dept Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time as faculty member</th>
<th>N=24</th>
<th>N=15</th>
<th>N=26</th>
<th>N=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. BEST method for selecting Dept Chair

Dept should collaborate with Dean in some way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time as faculty member</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>17% (N=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>33% (N=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>35% (N=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>12% (N=25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. BEST method for selecting Dept Chair

Rotating position among eligible faculty

- **Under 5 years**: 25% (N=24)
- **5-10 years**: 0% (N=15)
- **11-20 years**: 19% (N=26)
- **Over 20 years**: 12% (N=25)
Q5. BEST method for selecting Dept Chair

Candidates apply (w/ platform); dept selects

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents for each length of time as faculty member.](chart)

- Under 5 years: 8% (N=24)
- 5-10 years: 13% (N=15)
- 11-20 years: 8% (N=26)
- Over 20 years: 4% (N=25)
Comments on Chair Selection

• 29 comments given

• 9 in favor of current system – department elect chairs, no role for Dean

• 9 comments in favor of the current system, but with caveats, concerns, or tweaks

• 7 comments in favor of collaboration between department and Dean

• 4 “other” (e.g., have terms limits, hire from outside, or random other comments)
Comments in favor of current model:

- Since the chair will be leading the department and conducting the department's business, it is essential that the chair be a faculty member chosen (objectively and by secret ballot) by the department members.

- If it is not broke don't fix it!

- A Chair not elected by democratic means (one vote per department member) is a recipe for dysfunction within a department.

- The dean should not select the chairs; there is too much potential for abuse of power.

- You don't want the chair dependent on the dean for his or her ability to function. You want him or her alert to the needs of the department, what he or she can do to make faculty work easier.
Comments with concerns or caveats:

• I am in a collaborative department. Internal selection best fits that model.

• To ensure qualified candidates and sustain democratic choice, I think that elections should be held and candidates should present their vision for the department and ideas for its future. Departments should retain the power to select their chairs.

• A faculty who wants to be chair should like the position. Not all faculty has SKILLS to serve as a Chair. Some faculty are not good administrator and as a Chairperson that faculty must be.

• If a Department CAN NOT elect a chair from the department the Dean should find someone from outside the department.

• I would say that candidates should apply with a platform (vision) but in a case where the power dynamics mimic a dictatorship elections are a sham. There needs to be a system of checks and balances.
Comments in favor of collaboration:

- Department chairs wear two hats: faculty and administration; thus choosing chairs should be the work of both, ideally.

- Dept should have most of the power in this determination, but the Dean should have a say, and work with the department to help select best person, to identify and nurture new leadership across time, and to be sure all dept members' interests are served, even if not at the same time.

- I don't think the dept should "elect" the chair, per se -- that is, not through an outright "campaign and vote" model. The dept should select the chair based on discussion and, if necessary to break a deadlock of interests, confidential vote. The Dean's vote of confidence in the proposed chair should also be important to the members of the dept, since collaboration will be important.

- the Dean MUST play a role; highly regrettable abuse happens without this
• I believe that the election of a Chair is primarily a faculty duty and responsibility. However, I also believe that the Dean should have some voice in this process. This is certainly the way it works in most institutions and Fairfield's approach is the CAS is highly unusual.

• I didn't think this way before consulting with colleagues at other universities in a variety of places. It turns out we are something of an anomaly in not giving the Dean a say in our selection process.

• Simply putting someone in as chair because "it's their turn" is a disaster. Putting anyone in who doesn't have leadership skills and a vision -- preferably agreed on with the department -- for where the department needs to go is a disaster. When there's no suitable inside candidate, hire from outside.
Q7. Limits on consecutive terms for Chairs

Base: Total Respondents = 90
Q7. Limits on consecutive terms for Chairs

2 consec. terms (6 years, if re-elected/re-appointed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time as faculty member</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years (N=24)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years (N=15)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years (N=26)</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years (N=25)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments on Chair Term Limits
Against = 4, For = 12, Conditional = 7

Comments in against term limits:

• Up to the department.

• If the depts choose/elect the chair, then there should be no term limits.

• if the department does not want the chair to serve another term don't re elect

• I believe in no term limits, but only if the dean does not choose the chair. If the dean does choose the chair, there should be a 2 consecutive term limit.

• If chairs are doing a bad job, elections will provide term limits. If they're doing a good job and want to continue, more power to them.
Comments in favor of term limits:

• 6 years=more than ample.  if you haven't done it in six years, you ain't ever going to do it.

• Should be limited to one term, to avoid stagnation of departmental life

• Departments are not served by long-term chairs and those individuals are also not well served by this arrangement. Often faculty dread being chair, but then find that they have special skills or talents to share, and embrace the job. Still others may suffer through their turn, but then they will have a greater appreciation of their colleagues when they are chair. It is all around the best practice to have leadership turnover (theoretically--based on the organizational literature; philosophically--based on fairness, equity, and shared responsibility; and practically--most departments' situations necessitate sharing this load.

• I like the model that the Department selects the chair. The chair has a fixed term, that could be extended, but not beyond 6 years at one time. The chair would also have to have the approval of the Dean.

• Term limits are important since some people become ensconced in these positions and departments become stagnant and deep divisions can arise from old battles.
General Comments on Chairs

• a good and trusted caretaker.

• I like the chair personally and enjoy socializing with her/him, s/he is very pleasant. But s/he has not done a particularly good job as chair, in large measure because s/he shies away from confrontation in general and with the administration in particular.

• I think that my department chair has done a wonderful job. It is a difficult and unappreciated role. My chair is cordial and hospitable. I could not imagine a more pleasant person to work with and to represent the department. I have always felt as if my views have been considered carefully. My department chair sincerely values the work of each faculty member in this department. There is some room for improvement in the area of organization.

• I'm not convinced of the anonymity of this survey, so I'll skip this question.

• There are too many major problems to list. I suspect that the next chair won't be much of an improvement, however. We would benefit from the Dean stepping in and insisting that we hire a Chair from outside the university. But I can't see that happening.

• i am the current chair i am clearly second only to god
Implications of the Survey

• Despite problems and occasional abuses, most faculty are generally satisfied with their chairs, and even with the chair/dean relationship, though there is room for improvement.

• Chair compensation is considered insufficient and inequitable – consensus exists for change.

• Most faculty believe that chair term limits may be a desirable governance change (e.g., that could alleviate many of the current problems, whether those are seen from a faculty or dean perspective).

• Most faculty agree that the department and dean should collaborate in some way on chair selection.
What Next?

• Release data to wider faculty
• Send the check – discuss stipend increase with AVP
• Find “interimland” regarding compensation and selection
• Continue to discuss terms limits as a possible governance change? (fall proposal to CAS faculty)
• Consider strategies to demonstrate need for stipend increase