

Call to order 3:35pm

Members Present: Susan Hrach (COLS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS), Paula Adams (Lib), Jan Burcham (COEHP), Nick Norwood (COLS), Lisa Oberlander (COA), Neal Rogers (COBCS), David Schwimmer (COLS), Gary Sprayberry (COLS), John Studstill (COLS), John Theis (COBCS), Paul Vaillancourt (COA), Elizabeth Wurz (COLS), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS), Becky Becker (COA), Rita Jones (COBCS), Sandra Stratford (Lib), Dan VanKley (COLS)

Guests present included: Gina Sheeks, Tina Butcher, Tim Howard, Dana Larkin, Bryan Schwartz, Laurie Jones

**Attachments at the end:**

AAUP guidelines on Financial Exigency (attached)

Federal Age Discrimination Guidelines <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adea.cfm> and <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/index.cfm> as distributed during the meeting

CSU Faculty Senate Administrator Evaluation (attached)

**1. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer**

- a. Faculty Performance and Engagement Task Force web site:

<https://sites.google.com/a/colstate.edu/faculty-performance-and-engagement-task-force/?AuthEventSource=SSO>

The deadline for the Task Force to complete their work was the end of February, so the draft was sent to the Provost Sunday night. Suddenly late last week, the Task Force members were told they could share information with faculty, and have town hall meetings. Town Hall meetings March 17 at River Park campus, and two meetings on main campus: March 18 12:30 – 2, and another one. Location to be determined. The Task Force is still waiting to figure out what will be done with that information.

Dr. Howard encourages everyone to try the comment section online for the Task Force as soon as possible – it seems to be a little glitchy. If you log in through CougarNet first and then go to the websites, it works, but if you go directly to the URL it doesn't always get there.

Recommendations were posted as pdf file. Dr. Howard wants to know if anyone has trouble accessing the web site.

Question: Was Task Force meeting under the Open Meetings act? If so, agendas and minutes and dates of meeting should have been posted (and they weren't). Response: Dr. Howard does not know.

Comment: Sounds like the Task Force plan planned to gather feedback on the plan.

Comment: Perhaps most Task Forces are not under the Open Meetings plan.

Comment: Since this one will change policy of the University, perhaps this falls under these rules.

Question: What is the importance of this (Open Meetings Act)? The minutes, the agendas, the meeting dates must be made public. Who decides if it applies? The facts of the case. If decisions were made that affect personnel, should it have been public? There are legal consequences.

Isaac Corn Center, Theater on the Park Lobby

Comment: What we have now is a document on the table subject to public discussion and comment – The Task Force is now soliciting public comment. There will be a final proposal that will go to the Provost's office. What happens at that point, Dr. Howard does not know. Concern about Open Meetings is noted.

Question: Isn't it in our current statutes – current wording of Task Force procedures suggest that the Provost gets to decide. However, we have University Statutes in place to determine how these changes can occur – rules are amended by a majority of faculty present vote (2/3).

Comment: Statutes are not very refined at present, so changes suggested by the Task Force may be consistent with them already. Faculty are invited by Dr. Howard to see if proposal is consistent with BOR policy, to review it for themselves.

Comment: To find the Task Force website: browse all sites at colstate.edu, do search on provost. It is better to log in to CougarNet first, so that system recognizes domain. Faculty Performance and Engagement Task Force is official name. It is important for everyone to participate, provide feedback, follow the processes afterward and ensure that they follow the statutes.

Question: Is there another committee working on bylaws? Response: No. There is a committee editing the faculty handbook, but not bylaws or statutes.

Question: Will the link be mailed to all? Response: Dr. Howard can, but doesn't work well if not logged in first.

b. Meeting with Vice Chancellor Susan Herbst

Dr. Herbst met with the Chairs Assembly, Senate Executive Council, Deans and Assistant Provost (from 10 – 3?) On Thursday, February 25<sup>th</sup>. From the meetings, she was a very attentive listener, and had questions for us. She listened patiently while we expressed concerns in candid detail. When our part of that visit was over, Dr. Hrach felt that we had shared information as we should. Dr. Herbst took lots of notes, but we do not know what will be done with this information at this time.

The next step in our process to include faculty in governance: there will be a meeting with consultant Dr. Steven Portch on March 15<sup>th</sup>. We don't have any details about his agenda for that day at this time. Our understanding is that he does consulting work for USG, for things such as shared governance as well as other issues. It is an opportunity for several things, such as to propose other structures for campus governance if we want to make really big changes; he will also be forming impressions of the environment here. Provost's office is making room reservations.

Comment: I am intrigued by the coincidence of the meeting with Dr. Herbst, and the budget meetings afterward. In the meetings on Thursday and Friday, the whole faculty was invited. Instantly, there was whole faculty involvement. There's a difference between involving faculty in an intractable issue, and in issues that faculty are typically involved. The openness (glasnost) may terminate when we get back to real campus issues. Do you think there was any prior notice? Response: AAUP email from the state AAUP officers indicated University Presidents were informed that morning.

Comment: We had originally anticipated 3 people from BOR visiting, and the day prior, we were informed that it would only be Dr. Herbst. We can surmise this may be because of budget issues, but we do not know.

Comment: Presumably you shared violations of policy with Dr. Herbst. When you meet with Dr. Portch, we need to stress that governance is not the only issue that needs to be addressed

Isaac Corn Center, Theater on the Park Lobby

here. We should plan to bring issues to that meeting. We do not know whether Portch is hired by CSU or BOR. When we asked, Dr. Herbst's answer was "no comment".

Question: Could we push for an indication of how violations of policy are going to be dealt with?

Question: Do we have Dr. Portch's email? We could directly ask. Response: Perhaps, but could we gain more by working with him? We probably don't want to alienate anyone at this point.

We could ask a different question. We could ask Dr. Portch if he would like to see the documentation that K. Shaw (secretary to the Senate) provided to Dr. Herbst.

Question: On the same issue, we passed that resolution (on Promotion and Tenure) – does it have any demands? We should consider that before he comes, we request that those promoted out of the Colleges be promoted. Question: How many applied for reconsideration? Response: Several did not out of fear of consequences.

Question: Perhaps we could start by asking for clarification for Portch's timeline, and who he will be meeting with? We want to provide the same information to him that we provided to others, including references as needed. But we should be prepared to talk about our expectations for shared governance.

Comment: If we do this in a genteel manner, then I can't imagine he'll turn the documentation down. But we should not look angry and hostile, but rather look reasonable.

We also need to put the resolutions back on the agenda, since there is no timeline included. We should now call for a response. Depending on that response, there may be additional followup resolutions.

Comment: It is hard to know how to prepare without knowing about his agenda. For today's purposes, be prepared to meet that Monday at 3pm. We will circulate information via email about location when it becomes available.

Comment: The one satisfying thing about Dr. Herbst's visit was that she expressed how much she appreciated our professionalism to date in handling this situation. They (BOR) do not appear to perceive our approaching them as hostile or inappropriate. Dr. Hrach then publicly thanked Brian Schwartz for suggesting remediation or other services from BOR as a productive avenue for discussions. We do want to keep our tone productive and professional.

c. Additional meetings in March

Meeting with Dr. Portch on March 15.

Additional Senate meeting on March 22, in order to get committee reports, other business completed by end of academic year. (student evals on Digital Measures, etc) Location TBD.

2. Report from the Provost's Office (5 minutes)

Dr. Butcher and Dr. Howard present.

Dr. Levi and Dr. Mescon are in DC today, and there is no report to present.

This is your chance to ask burning questions about the budget.

Comment: We as a faculty and a campus were advised about the report to the BOR. From a practical stand, what feedback can we expect to see? We have presented a hypothetical plan, now in the legislature. Based on our BOR report, what's included, and will the faculty be advised of those cuts? I'm looking for continuation of feedback. Response: Saturday's discussion was in general terms. Saturday's list is in priority order. The draft from the night

Isaac Corn Center, Theater on the Park Lobby

before was taken, modified, no new items added, one was removed. There was a clustering, so that if budget cuts are smaller, we have a system in place.

Comment: At several occasions, comments were made that institution-wide discussions would be needed, particularly in elimination of personnel, particularly if the burden fell on one department or one college. Is there any evaluation of where the 14 faculty, 10 staff will come from?

Comment: Distribution of handout on age discrimination from Federal law – there is no exception for financial exigency. How could you base retirement on anything other than age?

Comment: On Saturday morning, there was discussion of potential effect on programs, and the randomness of the effect if based only on retirements. Retirements potentially could devastate programs. Changes allowed more flexibility in cuts – but should include campus wide discussion in where cuts occur.

Distributed an AAUP document on financial exigency and faculty terminations. Document attached at the end of the minutes.

Comment: Recommendation of places to reduce expenses instead of from faculty lines is on 3<sup>rd</sup> page – many of which we touched on last week.

Comment: Much about the budget is still up in the air.

Comment: It seems like they built a lot of “wiggle room” into these cuts, and we need to be vigilant to be sure that cuts are discussed further.

Comment: I understand that at this point we can't bring up furloughs again. I wonder if they aren't going to impose them later on. It may be a way to prevent layoffs. A number of other universities have discussed graduated furloughs or salary cuts, so that those at the bottom don't bear the brunt.

Comment: AAUP guidelines state that termination, for certain categories of faculty, should be with 1 year notice, or with 1 year salary. They are either not relevant or won't be followed. We should remind the Provost's office of AAUP guidelines with regards to budget cuts.

Dr. Butcher adds: she sat in on Thursday morning teleconference. They are hoping for cuts to be smaller (\$120M). However, it may be as much as a \$400M cut to USG.

Comment: The first item (faculty staff cuts) is the most troublesome.

Question: Why is eliminating unfilled positions a lower priority than eliminating faculty/staff?

Question: Part of this priority list was designed for shock value for the legislature. Perhaps this is part of the calculation?

Question: Have the positions already been identified? I think not. The original \$1.8M cut was from those faculty with 30+ years in the system, and the dollar value predicted to be saved if all of them retired. This was done for shock value. If the cuts are smaller, we can re-prioritize.

Comment: There is a conflicting message of “we can prioritize”, and “we will be stuck with it”.

Comment: The Legislature normally would have a budget by April. It is important to contact your legislators! Please discuss, among other things, the impact on the economy, and on our students.

Comment: If cuts do come down, any that impact the Faculty Performance and Engagement Task Force – point it out. We must account for those cuts in faculty evaluation rules.

Comment: If we do any cuts, they will take effect July 1. We could have advertised classes we can't offer if we aren't careful. Fall schedule – also a worry. Response: Summer classes are typically paid them out of summer tuition money, not state allocations.

### 3. Old Business

- a. Membership for Special Designation Task Force – please be prepared to nominate faculty to the Task Force!

The Task Force is at a standstill until the it is reformed. We can recommend how to nominate regular faculty or senate members to Task force, making sure each college has a regular faculty representative, and one senate representative. Thoughts?

Comment: Volunteers first. Self-nomination

Comment: The Provost is not dead set, we think, about retaining the original task force. She commented that now that the charge has changed, that some members may not wish to continue serving.

Question: Would we give Provost or Deans a pool to choose from?

Comment: Suggest that each college come up with their own procedures. Perhaps try to involve younger faculty? Response: But the younger faculty need to focus on getting published.

Comment: It is fine to have each college choose its own procedure, but we shouldn't be completely vague. We want the rank and file faculty to have a choice.

Comment: Senators from each College could conduct nominations/elections within Colleges.

Question: Will the library faculty be excluded from the task force?

Question: Was anything said about tenure status? No, but seems like a good idea.

Comment: The procedure will involve senators from each College and the Library soliciting nominations. Senate should make recommendations about how many per College.

Comment: The fact that we need to worry about tenure status says a great deal about the status of faculty morale.

Comment: This really ought to be an exercise in grassroots democracy. Recommend that the Library have one, each College have at least one. At least 10 administrators already on task force, if they remain.

**Senator Studstill** moves that 2 names per College, 1 name for the Library, and 1 Senate member at large be chosen by College caucuses from among the tenured faculty. There will be a deadline of March 22<sup>nd</sup> to obtain those names. **Senator Norwood** seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

### 4. New Business

- a. Tobacco-Free Campus Proposal (Dana Larkin and Gina Sheeks and Student Life representatives)

We are looking at having CSU be a Tobacco-Free campus. Several students from alcohol and drug education task force, Laurie Jones present. The President's Cabinet, and Staff Council have already endorsed this.

Cessation programs would be available to students, faculty, staff. Student activity fees would pay for cessation programs for students. The group endorses the compliance approach. If adopted, we might start as early as fall, with education campaign in spring 2010.

Question: Query about question 4 on survey: what difference between tobacco vs cigarettes?

Question: How much will this cost? Biggest cost will be advertising. Task force has small budget, from student activity fees – target this to students; mandated to report on what we are doing to promote healthy lifestyles. Cessation program – HR would look for grants initially to aid faculty and staff.

Question: Are there other parts of our student health program? There are other things like eating habits, exercise that are equally important. Student life does do these things as well. Timely

Isaac Corn Center, Theater on the Park Lobby

discussion with our new recreation center being built. In general, trying to promote healthy lifestyles, like safe spring break education activities.

Question: What are other universities doing? Do they have “smoking spot”? Isn’t that draconian? Staff council proposed this as well, or to do this in stages. Right now, guidelines state smokers must be 25 feet from building. Staff council suggests find a place far away – but then are we tobacco free?

Be careful about the difference between tobacco free and smoke free. Will there be an exception for personal cars?

Comment: We already do compliance type things, with no results. Compliance is more an educational issue, not enforcement.

Comment: Rewards may have better impact than punishment. Time it to coincide with new recreation center sounds like a good idea.

Comment re productivity: if smokers have to leave office, move car, find new parking place – this will be detrimental to productivity. If you have been around someone smoking in their car, you may not want to share work space with them.

**Senator Schwimmer** moves that we adopt smoke free campus. Motion seconded by **Senator Theis**.

A friendly amendment was offered by **Senator Studstill**, that smoking only be allowed in remote locations to be established by the “Smoke-Free” committee. The amendment was accepted.

The committee is looking for endorsement of the idea from campus constituencies.

What about timeline? Tie it to rec center opening.

Vote: one opposed. **Motion passes.**

b. Military Enrollment (John Fuller)

Mr. Fuller is a part time consultant, working with the Computer Science department. Mr. Fuller was present to tell us about initiative to increase our military enrollments. We expect to see over 28000 move to Columbus region with BRAC. We would expect to see our enrollments grow along with population growth, up to around 9000.

Study began Jan 11, will end June 30. Should be implementing recommendations by then.

Growth means more revenue. But there are also 43 defense contractors working in the region – this means many opportunities for us.

Expected outcomes: tied to increasing enrollment.

Difficulty – getting demographic data from our databases

Currently there is no career progression program for infantry – can we serve that need? This is at present a lost opportunity.

Recommendations are tied to strategic plan.

Should target more than just active duty military: families, civilians, contractors, reserves.

Need help as senate, and faculty, - need recommendations. Will likely come as survey. Will be focus groups – esp active duty students, spouses.

Follow up questions: [jfuller@columbusgachamber.com](mailto:jfuller@columbusgachamber.com)

5. Reports:

a. Evaluation of Administrators Committee (John Theis)

Isaac Corn Center, Theater on the Park Lobby

A document for potential evaluation of administrators was distributed to Senators. This document will be voted on at the next regular Senate meeting, and it is recommended that the Senate establish this as a standing committee. [Attached copy of draft evaluation.](#)

Meeting adjourned.

.....  
<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/finexg.htm>

## Financial Exigency, Academic Governance, and Related Matters (2004)

The report that follows was prepared by a joint subcommittee of the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure and the Association's Committee on College and University Governance, and has been approved for publication by the two standing committees.

### ***II. Termination of Faculty Appointments***

Early in its history, the AAUP recognized that a college or university could legitimately terminate faculty appointments, including appointments with tenure, on grounds of financial exigency. In 1925, the AAUP joined in formulating the "American Council on Education Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure," which provided that

Termination of permanent or long-term appointments because of financial exigency should be sought only as a last resort, after every effort has been made to meet the need in other ways and to find for the teacher other employment in the institution. Situations which make retrenchment of this sort necessary should preclude expansions of the staff at other points at the same time, except in extraordinary circumstances.<sup>4</sup>

The landmark 1940 [\*Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure\*](#), issued jointly by the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities), was briefer than the 1925 statement on the subject of financial exigency but more emphatic: "Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide." In addition, the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* calls for faculty to have primary responsibility for decisions affecting academic programs and faculty status. From these two statements, the AAUP derived the provisions on financial exigency in its [\*Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure\*](#) (RIR). The Association's most complete official statement of the standards and procedures that it believes should govern the termination of faculty appointments for financial reasons appears in regulation 4(c) of the RIR.

Regulation 4(c) starts with a definition of financial exigency: it is an "imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole."<sup>5</sup> Worth emphasizing is that the survival of the institution in its entirety, not just a part of it, must be at stake. Moreover, the crisis must be one that "cannot be alleviated by less drastic means" than the termination of faculty

appointments. The exigency must be genuine and so must the need to release tenured faculty members or other members of the faculty before the end of their specified terms.

The RIR continues with a description of the ways in which the faculty and the administration should share decision-making responsibilities in dealing with the institution's financial problems. First, a faculty body "should participate in the decision that a financial exigency exists or is imminent, and that all feasible alternatives to termination of appointments have been pursued." It should be noted that the text does not state that the faculty has "primary responsibility" with respect to these particular decisions. The regulation implicitly acknowledges that the administration and the board of trustees have major responsibilities for identifying serious problems that may imperil the institution's financial health, and that they, not the faculty, are primarily responsible for ensuring the continued solvency of the institution.

Second, the faculty should, however, have primary responsibility for "judgments determining where within the overall academic program termination of appointments may occur," because such judgments "involve considerations of educational policy, including affirmative action, as well as of faculty status."

Third, the faculty's primary responsibility also extends to "determining the criteria for identifying the individuals whose appointments are to be terminated." The RIR adds that these criteria "may appropriately include considerations of length of service."

Fourth, the RIR assigns to the faculty what might be called an indirect role in identifying the individuals "whose appointments are to be terminated." The responsibility for identification is in the hands of a "person or group designated or approved by the faculty."

Regulation 4(c) then turns to the right to a "full hearing before a faculty committee" of a faculty member who has been issued notice of termination because of financial exigency. The regulation declares that the "essentials of an on-the-record adjudicative hearing will be observed." Regulation 4(c) does not specify the "essentials," but they include the faculty member's right to present witnesses and evidence, to cross-examine all witnesses, and to be provided with a record of the hearing. The regulation goes on to identify the issues that may be raised in the hearing: the existence and extent of the condition of financial exigency, with the burden on the administration to prove that the exigent condition exists and that it threatens the entire institution; the validity of the educational judgments and criteria for identifying which faculty appointments will be terminated, but with the recognition that the recommendation of a faculty body concerning these matters will be considered presumptively valid; and the criteria that have been applied in the particular case.

Regulation 4(c) goes on to caution that the appointments of tenured faculty members should not be terminated because of financial exigency "in favor of retaining a faculty member without tenure, except in extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion of the academic program would otherwise result." In addition, before a faculty appointment is terminated for financial reasons, the institution, with faculty participation, is to "make every effort to place the faculty member concerned in another suitable position within the institution."

As for the faculty member whose appointment is actually terminated, the RIR calls for at least one year of notice or severance salary for the individual who has served at least eighteen months at the institution. In addition, released professors are granted recall rights. Their places will not be filled by a replacement for a period of three years, unless the affected individuals have been offered reinstatement and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline the offer.

## IV. Next Steps

### 2. Steps to Reduce Expenses

1. Identify potential energy cost savings throughout the institution (for example, the heating and cooling of buildings and the use of elevators). Identify cost savings in the use of supplies and paper and in telephone, mail, computer, and duplicating and printing services. Reduce advertising costs. Close individual buildings at specific times to save utility and maintenance costs.
2. Defer major and minor repair and maintenance for as long as possible. Postpone major building projects.
3. Negotiate with the local government for free services, or reduced costs for current services. Review auxiliary services to reduce costs. Reduce or eliminate external consultants.
4. Reduce travel, entertainment, and conference expenditures. Reduce expenses for recruitment of staff and faculty. Reduce library and academic department subscriptions to newspapers, magazines, and journals.
5. Reduce or eliminate expenditures for nonacademic functions, services, and activities that are not essential to the institution's academic mission. Reduce expenses for leases and contracts with outside vendors.
6. Reduce the number of visiting scholars and lecturers. Reduce the number of graduate assistantships. Reduce over-time. Encourage early retirement for staff and faculty if, in the long run, these are programmatically desirable and cost effective. Encourage leave without pay. Delay filling staff and faculty positions.
7. Reduce or close academic programs or departments and, as needed, transfer faculty appointments to other academic units. Review benefit plans and coverage. Consider freezes on salaries, furloughs of staff and faculty, and reductions of salaries.

.....  
The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967

<http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adea.cfm>

<http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/index.cfm>

## CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 621. [Section 2]

(a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that-

Isaac Corn Center, Theater on the Park Lobby

(1) in the face of rising productivity and affluence, older workers find themselves disadvantaged in their efforts to retain employment, and especially to regain employment when displaced from jobs;

(2) the setting of arbitrary age limits regardless of potential for job performance has become a common practice, and certain otherwise desirable practices may work to the disadvantage of older persons;

(3) the incidence of unemployment, especially long-term unemployment with resultant deterioration of skill, morale, and employer acceptability is, relative to the younger ages, high among older workers; their numbers are great and growing; and their employment problems grave;

(4) the existence in industries affecting commerce, of arbitrary discrimination in employment because of age, burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce.

(b) It is therefore the purpose of this chapter to promote employment of older persons based on their ability rather than age; to prohibit arbitrary age discrimination in employment; to help employers and workers find ways of meeting problems arising from the impact of age on employment.

## DEFINITIONS

### SEC. 630. [Section 11]

For the purposes of this chapter-

(a) The term “person” means one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, labor organizations, corporations, business trusts, legal representatives, or any organized groups of persons.

(b) The term “employer” means a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has twenty or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year: Provided, That prior to June 30, 1968, employers having fewer than fifty employees shall not be considered employers. The term also means (1) any agent of such a person, and (2) a State or political subdivision of a State and any agency or instrumentality of a State or a political subdivision of a State, and any interstate agency, but such term does not include the United States, or a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States.

## PROHIBITION OF AGE DISCRIMINATION

### SEC. 623. [Section 4]

(a) Employer practices

(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's age;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's age; or

(3) to reduce the wage rate of any employee in order to comply with this chapter.

(b) It shall be unlawful for an employment agency to fail or refuse to refer for employment, or other-wise to discriminate against, any individual because of such individual's age, or to classify or refer for employment any individual on the basis of such individual's age.

#### AGE LIMITS

SEC. 631. [Section 12]

(a) Individuals of at least 40 years of age

The prohibitions in this chapter shall be limited to individuals who are at least 40 years of age.

(b) Employees or applicants for employment in Federal Government

In the case of any personnel action affecting employees or applicants for employment which is subject to the provisions of section 633a of this title [section 15], the prohibitions established in section 633a of this title [section 15] shall be limited to individuals who are at least 40 years of age.

(c) Bona fide executives or high policymakers

(1) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit compulsory retirement of any employee who has attained 65 years of age and who, for the 2-year period immediately before retirement, is employed in a bona fide executive or a high policymaking position, if such employee is entitled to an immediate nonforfeitable annual retirement benefit from a pension, profit-sharing, savings, or deferred compensation plan, or any combination of such plans, of the employer of such employee, which equals, in the aggregate, at least \$44,000.

.....

### **Columbus State University Faculty Senate Administrator Evaluation**

**Please respond to the below statements by marking a number from 1 to 4 indicating how strongly you agree, 1 being strongly agree and 4 being strongly disagree with the statement.**

1. Shares information in an unbiased manner

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

2. Shares information about budget, strategic plan openly

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

3. Listens actively; seeking information from students, faculty, and staff

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

4. Incorporates suggestions from all constituents whenever possible

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

5. Regularly meets with unit personnel and shares minutes and announcements of meetings in a timely fashion

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

**B. Professional Behavior-- This administrator:**

1. Is current and active in teaching and research

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

2. Always conducts him/herself in an ethical manner fully compliant with the BOR Ethics Policies

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

3. Treats faculty, staff and students with respect and courtesy

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
----------------	-------	----------	-------------------	------------

1	2	3	4	0
---	---	---	---	---

4. Supports development of quality teaching, research

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

5. Supports MY development as a faculty member

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

**C. Decision making/problem solving—This administrator**

1. Seeks information before making a decision

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

2. Applies all policies consistently, fairly, and in compliance with institutional regulations

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

3. Puts forth effort to solicit faculty input for decisions and in communicating the basis for decisions which are made.

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

4. Utilizes collaborative decision making whenever possible.

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

**D. Interpersonal Skills—This administrator:**

1. Always behaves in a collegial manner.

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

2. Promotes scholarship in the university, his/her college, or department

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

4. Communicates ideas effectively

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

5. Receptive to ideas of others and gives credit for their contributions

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

**E. Planning and Vision—This administrator:**

1. Is an open, effective, financial manager who uses funds appropriately to further scholarly research

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

2. Uses resources to foster creative inquiry and student engagement

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

3. Balances distribution of resources in alignment with strategic plan and strategic goals

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

4. Remains current, is consistently forward looking and creative in approaching present and future academic and economic demands

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

5. Identifies forces in the environment that will affect the academic unit and acts to safeguard and improve the unit

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

6. Communicates long-term vision for department/school/college with those involved and initiates actions to reach those goals

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

**Overall Evaluation**

This university/college/department administrator has my confidence in his/her leadership..

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	0

**Any written comments?**