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## Purpose of the Policy

As a result of the September 2021 Provost's Council of Chairs discussion and feedback provided by the Chairs, Provost Capps established and charged in October 2021 the Department Chair Appointment Task Force with development of a university policy that would help ensure two primary objectives:

1. Chair compensation (assigned time and overall Chair-related salary) is equitable and fair, and that the criteria and/or metrics that guide the compensation level is transparent so that there is continuity within and across the colleges.
2. Department Chairs can be available 12 months a year (with opportunity for time away from work) for planning, advising, supporting students and faculty, implementing critical projects assigned by the provost's office and/or dean's office, and interacting with a variety of campus stakeholders as well as the community, along with other duties outlined in the Department Chair Handbook, the Duties for Department Chairs Outside of Academic Year, and the Responsibilities of Department Chairs.

Critical work of the Task Force in 2021 included conducting listening sessions with each college Council of Chairs and distributing a survey among the Chairs in each of the colleges (and in College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences - CAHSS, the Program Leads who had been part of CAHSS reorganization) to get a sense of perceptions regarding clarity on roles, responsibilities, and alignment between compensation and workload. Based on feedback from the colleges, the Task Force considered variables that contribute to Chair workload throughout the year (academic year and periods outside of the academic year such as summer, fall, winter, and spring breaks) and how they relate to workload, reviewed existing models for calculating assigned time (AT), and conducted a preliminary statistical analysis to examine effect of variables.

## Background

In September 2021, a discussion in the Provost's Council of Chairs meeting was facilitated, reviewing issues that have been raised at the university related to clarity, transparency, equity, and continuity of Department Chair appointments across the academic colleges. In that discussion, several resources for the appointment and carrying out the duties of Department Chairs were shared, as posted on the Academic Personnel Services (APS) webpage, including documents such as:

- Department Chair Handbook
- Duties for Department Chairs Outside of Academic Year
- Responsibilities of Department Chairs
- Roles, Responsibilities, Resources, and Rewards for Department Chairs: A Report to the Academic Senate, California State University from the Task Force on Roles and Responsibilities of Chairs


## Definitions

FTE Staff: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of Staff
FTES: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of students served by department.
HC Majors: Relative Headcount number of Majors served by department.
HC Staff: Relative Headcount number of staff.
Temp FTEF: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of Temporary Faculty.
Temp HC: Relative Headcount number of temporary faculty.
TT FTEF: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of Tenure Track Faculty.

## Policy Details

## I. Allocation Model

Average values for the 2019-2022 academic years across several metrics related to faculty, staff and student numbers for each department (listed in the Definitions section) were used to create metric norms (see Table 1). These normed values are then used to scale each department's metric values, which are gathered by Institutional Research, Analytics, and Reporting (IRAR). Unlike other models where the scaling factors could change with time, these normed values will hold constant as the university moves forward. The intent is that the normed values will allow for an increase in workload as the university and programs grow.

Table 1. Metric Norms Based on University-Wide Department Averages for Academic Years 2019-2022

| Metric | TT FTEF | Temp HC | Temp FTEF | HC Majors | FTES | HC Staff | FTE Staff |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Norm | 6 | 8 | 3.5 | 150 | 150 | 2 | 1.5 |

Chair workload is weighted according to three overall categories: Faculty comprise $50 \%$ of workload, Students comprise $40 \%$, and staff comprise $10 \%$. Within each category, each metric is weighted and divided by its normed value. Using normed values helps ensure that a given category contributes the appropriate amount to the composite score. The 3 -year rolling average (ending with the most recent academic year) for each metric is provided by IRAR.

$$
\begin{aligned}
=50 \% & {\left[60 \%\left(\frac{\text { TT FTEF }}{N_{\text {TTFTEF }}}\right)+40 \%\left(50 \% \frac{\text { Temp HC }}{N_{H C T}}+50 \% \frac{\text { Temp FTEF }}{N_{T F T E F}}\right)\right] } \\
& +40 \%\left[50 \%\left(\frac{\text { HC Majors }}{N_{H C M}}\right)+50 \%\left(\frac{\text { FTES }}{N_{F T E S}}\right)\right] \\
& +10 \%\left[50 \%\left(\frac{\text { HC Staff }}{N_{\text {HCStaff }}}\right)+50 \%\left(\frac{\text { FTE Staff }}{N_{\text {FTEStaff }}}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

The composite scores are then applied to the Minimum Chair Support table (Table 2) to determine the minimum Chair FTE and WTU:

Table 2. Minimum Chair Support (FTE \& WTU)

| Comp Score | Model AT (FTE) | AT in WTU/ <br> Semester |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<0.4$ | 0.3 FTE | 4.5 |
| $0.4-0.79$ | 0.4 FTE | 6 |
| $0.8-1.19$ | 0.5 FTE | 7.5 |
| $1.2-1.59$ | 0.67 FTE | 10 |
| $1.6-1.99$ | 0.8 FTE | 12 |
| $2.0-2.99$ | 1.0 FTE | 15 |
| $3.0-3.99$ | 1.3 FTE | 19.5 |
| $4.0-4.99$ | 1.4 FTE | 21 |
| $5.0-5.99$ | 1.5 FTE | 22.5 |

The calculation generated from the allocation model is a minimum allocation of AT FTE. This (or any) allocation model cannot capture the complexity and variability of Chair duties in different departments (such as multiple majors, graduate programs, institutes, external accreditation, running a facility, etc). The model uses metrics and criteria that all departments share and excludes criteria that are not present in all departments. However, this is not an indication that other criteria that contribute to a Chair's workload are not important or that they do not justify additional AT. Any additional workload and/or complexity of workload not captured in the model may be discussed between the Chair and Dean, and additional compensation above this minimum may be assigned in acknowledgement of the additional workload, as appropriate.

## II. Implementation \& Timeline

Chair assigned time is applied to direct instructional units, not to indirect instructional units (colloquially known as collateral duties). For 1.0 or higher FTE Department Chairs, the Chair assigned time includes all faculty units (both direct and indirect instructional units) and it is up to the Chair, the department, and their Dean to find ways to reduce any workload associated with indirect instructional activity, such as student advisement, curriculum development and improvements, and committee assignments that are not included in the Chair assignment (resources that can serve to guide these discussions in the case of 1.0 FTE Chairs include, and are posted on the APS website, the Department Chair Handbook, Duties for Department Chairs Outside of Academic Year, Responsibilities of Department Chairs, as well as CSU's EP\&R 76-36 Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures).

The procedures will include a timeline in order to ensure that the various offices can coordinate their work in time to establish the allocation calculations by February 1st. Chairs will be given at least four weeks to approve of the Dean's calculations, prepare for incoming Chair assignments, and/or to negotiate beyond the minimum calculation, if appropriate.

## III. Guidelines for 12-Month Chair Appointment

- A 12-month Chair appointment is a voluntary, opt-in appointment for Department Chairs made in consultation with their Dean.
- Chairs who commit to a 2-year continuous Department Chair position are eligible to opt into the 12-month position.
- 12-month Chair assignments must commence on August 1st and terminate on July 31st in a subsequent year (ensures consistent monthly pay).
- The 12-month Department Chair position is at the timebase fraction (TBF) for the Department Chair workload.

If Chairs prefer to have flexible appointments for outside-AY days throughout the year (e.g., summer, fall break, winter break, spring break) so that they may allocate, in collaboration with and approval by the Dean, part or all of the designated Department Chair WTUs and duties to other faculty during outside-AY days, they should not opt for the 12-month appointment.

If Chairs choose not to opt into the 12-month position, they will be given an outside-AY (OAY) appointment, in addition to their AY Department Chair appointment.

## IV. Points of Emphasis and Clarification

a. The AT allocation model calculation is considered the minimum Chair timebase allocation. When there are changes in complexities or volume of workload that are not captured in the model (e.g., accreditation reports and visit preparation, additional responsibilities related to facilities, or other special circumstances), the Chair and Dean may discuss additional compensation above this minimum as appropriate.
b. When Department Chair AT is greater than 1.0 FTE, the department, in consultation with the Dean, may determine whether the additional Chair role is a Co-Chair (with equivalent organizational-level authority) or a Vice-Chair (with organizational-level authority underneath the Department Chair), and how the WTUs and corresponding responsibilities are allocated across the two positions.
c. The focus of this proposed model is the metrics and formula that drive the model - not the specific data that are utilized to illustrate how the model is applied for any given
department. It is possible for reorganization to alter which programs are captured in the metrics of a given department, and it is possible that the university's coding of departments and corresponding data and organizational reality being implemented within a college might not match at a given point in time. When that is the case, it would be important to ensure that the organizational structure in practice is reflected in the data that is entered/used when applying the model.
d. The role and responsibilities of a Department Chair at Cal Poly Humboldt are articulated in three key documents posted on the APS webpage: Responsibilities of Department Chairs; Duties for Department Chairs Outside of Academic Year; and the Department Chair Handbook. Within each college, the Dean, Chair, and Program Lead(s) of academic programs within an academic department should work together to ensure that roles and responsibilities between a Department Chair and a Program Lead are appropriate to each position.

1. Not all programs have a Program Lead.
2. Alternate titles for Program Leads include 'Program Director,' 'Program Coordinator,' or other titles as conventional to the field, guided by accreditation bodies, or as informed by other guiding factors.
3. While there are duties that can be shared between Department Chairs and Program Leads, they are distinct roles, and Program Leads do not have primary responsibility for the work of a Department Chair. Certainly two-way consultation, advisement, and serving as thought partners on issues and tasks is expected, but ultimately, responsibility for the duties articulated in the key Department Chair documents listed above sit with the Department Chair.
4. It should be noted that a Department Chair is the faculty member leading an academic department, whereas a Program Lead is a faculty member leading an academic program that organizationally resides within an academic department.
e. Note that while ordinarily academic programs reside within the college and department organizational structure, sometimes unique circumstances, such as with an interdisciplinary program, are best served by organizationally placing the academic program outside of an academic college, whereby the Program Lead is leading an academic program that organizationally resides, for example, within the Office of Academic Programs, which is led by the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs \& Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. It is possible that an academic department may have several academic programs residing within a single academic department, and the Department Chair appointment should clearly reflect the leadership of a single department with multiple academic programs residing within it. Also, it is possible that two departments may share a single person that chairs both departments. In these cases, the assigned time should reflect the sum of the model predictions from all departments being chaired by that person. The university's recognized organizational structure related to academic colleges in the Division of Academic Affairs is as follows:
5. Level 1: College - a Major Business Unit (MBU) within the Division of Academic Affairs; led by a Dean
6. Level 2: Department - the largest organizational level within the MBU; led by a Department Chair
7. Level 3: Academic Program - the largest organizational level within the Department; led by a Program Lead/Director/Coordinator. It is critical to note that this is not an officially coded organizational level by the university or the

CSU system. Therefore, this "Academic Program" level is an informal level that requires manual data sorting in order to separate metrics by academic program.
f. It is important to note that a "12-month Chair appointment" is not necessarily synonymous with a full-time year-round Chair. A 12-month Chair appointment is a yearround appointment at the designated chair timebase fraction. For example, if the Chair timebase fraction generated by the model is 0.40 timebase, then the Chair would be working at a 0.40 timebase during periods outside of the academic year, when they are not performing other faculty duties. However, if the Chair timebase generated by the model is 1.00 timebase, then the Chair would be working full-time during periods outside of the academic year.
g. The model in this proposal applies to stateside programs only, and generates timebase allocation based only on the stateside program metrics within a department. Selfsupport programs academically reside in the academic college and department, but are administered through Extended Education. Chairs of departments that have self-support programs receive compensation separate from and in addition to their stateside timebase allocation, negotiated separately through agreements between the academic college and the College of Extended Education and Global Engagement (CEEGE).
h. The model calculations for non-instructional departments who do not have student majors or student FTES have been simplified. The weight of the three components in the formula for the composite score have been adjusted from what the instructional departments use (50\% faculty, 40\% students and 10\% staff), to 80\% faculty and 20\% staff (and therefore 0\% students). This simplified model reflects the current AT for the Library, but as the campus grows and if other non-instructional departments gain department chair positions, this should be re-examined to ensure that it is fair and equitable across non-instructional departments as well being fair and equitable with all departments across the university.
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