

(Passed by Faculty Senate November 2, 1999)

Proposed changes to Constitution and Bylaws
of Indiana University East Faculty
Senate relating to:

Review of Division Chairs and Deans

THE FOLLOWING IS A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BYLAWS OF THE CONSTITUTION

Proposed changes to Section VLB.4

CHANGE 1

original statement:

Section VI.B.4 Evaluation of the Division Chairpersons - Procedures

amended statement:

Section VI.B.4 *Review of Division Chairs and Deans* - Procedures

CHANGE 2

The terms "division chair, chairperson, or chair" will be changed to "*division chairs and deans*" wherever they occur throughout the description of procedures.

CHANGE 3

Under the question, "How Frequently Should Evaluation be Completed?" change the word "evaluation" to *review*. The subsequent statement will be amended as follows:

original statement:

An evaluation should be completed at least once every two years. Academic division chairpersons will also have the opportunity to request annual evaluations to aid in their preparation for promotion and tenure or to receive feedback on divisional operations.

amended statement:

A *review* will be completed at least once every two years. *Division chairs and/or deans* will also have the opportunity to request annual *reviews* to aid in their preparation for promotion and tenure or to receive feedback on divisional operations. *At the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will report the names of each division chair or dean that will be reviewed during that year.*

Proposed changes to Constitution and Bylaws
of Indiana University East Faculty
Senate relating to:

Review of Division Chairs and Deans

CHANGE 4

Under the question "Who Should Receive the Summary of Tabulated Results?" the subsequent statement will be amended to read:

original statement:

A written summary of the tabulated results, compiled by the peer evaluation facilitators, should be presented to the chairperson and be made available for review and discussion by the division faculty and staff in the Chairperson's division. It is the responsibility of the peer evaluation facilitators to call a divisional meeting, excluding the division chair, to discuss those results. The chairperson should have had the opportunity to review and discuss the results with his/her peer evaluation facilitators prior to Divisional Review. Copies of the written summary of results should not be distributed among faculty in order to ensure confidentiality of the results. The same summary will be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

amended statement:

A report, which consists of a written summary of the tabulated numerical results and a synthesis of the written comments, produced by the review and compiled by the peer reviewers, will be presented to the academic division head. The person being reviewed will be allowed seven (7) days to provide an optional response to this report. The report and the division chair or dean's response (should she or he elect to provide one) will be sent to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Peer reviewers will call a meeting of the Division Chairs or Dean's division. At that division meeting, with the chair or dean absent, peer reviewers will present an oral report, which summarizes the ratings and synthesis of written comments produced by the review.

In producing their report, peer reviewers will attempt to communicate the essence of the written comments. However, exact wording of the comments will not be included in the synthesis. The summary of tabulated numerical ratings will indicate areas in which the division chair or dean's performance was perceived unsatisfactory and those areas where the activity is perceived to be satisfactory.