

Department Chair Assigned Time Policy [XXX]

Office of the Provost

Applies to: All academic department chairs, academic Deans and Provost

Issued:
MM/DD/YYYY
Revised:
MM/DD/YYYY
Edited:
MM/DD/YYYY
Reviewed:
MM/DD/YYYY

The role of the department chair occupies a singularly difficult role on University Campuses. Chairs have enormous responsibilities, but nearly zero authority. A thorough report written for the Chancellor's Office in 2002 on Department Chair Duties¹ concluded, "*Chairs are expected to shuffle mounds of paper and respond to a multitude of requests from all levels, the administration, faculty and students. Chairs are expected to guide their departments in the present and help plan for the future, yet often they do not have the fiscal authority to distribute resources to best support these expectations...Chairs not only do not have the authority to do more than 'respond' to the requests of others, they do not have the time.*" This report acknowledged the increased workload expected of chairs at the time. Without question the expectations and complexity of CSU chair workload has only increased over the last decade and a half. Likewise, HSU has also seen a dramatic increase in Chair Duties over the last 15 years. In particular the frequency and number of reports due through PREP far exceeds the expectations of a once every 7 years program review. Likewise, as the tenure track density has fallen on our campus, chairs spend a significant portion of their time finding and evaluating temporary faculty. While the duties of department chairs have evolved over the years, the way in which assigned time for those duties is allotted on our campus has not. At HSU, each chair must negotiate with their Dean an FTE percentage of their chair duties. Some chairs (and deans) may not even realize that these appointments are negotiable and simply agree to the historical assigned time allotted to previous chairs for that department. This type of historical compensation model has led to chairs of similar sized departments being given vastly different amount of assigned time to carry out similar duties. Such a model also does not take into account how department sizes may grow or shrink with time, nor does it allow for changes as programs become more or less complex.

Purpose of the Policy

The purpose of this policy is to establish a method to determine the base assigned time for department chair duties. The FTE percentage of a faculty member's workload for chair duties shall be based on a 15 wtu/semester workload and be calculated using simple metrics obtained from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. This model uses both FTE and headcount data for faculty, students and staff and is based upon the relative size of each measure to that of the largest department on campus for that measure, e.g., if the largest department has 35 Tenure line FTEF, then the FTEF TT score for a department with 15 tenure

¹ *The California State University Department Chair Survey Report*, Chu & Veregge, 2002.

line FTEF would be $15/35 = 0.429$.

Definitions:

FTE TT: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of Tenure Track Faculty.

HC Temp Faculty: Relative Headcount number of temporary faculty.

FTEF Temp Faculty: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of Temporary Faculty.

HC Majors: Relative Headcount number of Majors served by department.

FTES: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of students served by department.

HC Staff: Relative Headcount number of staff.

FTE Staff: Relative Full Time Equivalent number of Staff

Policy Details

- I. To calculate base department chair FTE assignment, a composite score based on seven relative measures of department size are weighted by the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Composite Score} &= 50[0.5*\text{FTEF TT} + 0.5(0.5*\text{HC Temp Faculty} + 0.5 \text{FTEF Temp Faculty})] \\ &+ 40[0.6* \text{HC Majors} + 0.4*\text{FTES}] \\ &+ 10 [0.5*\text{HC Staff} + 0.5 \text{FTE Staff}] \end{aligned}$$

Once a composite score has been calculated, the base FTE assigned time shall be determined from the following Minimum Chair Support Chart:

Minimum Chair Support

<i>Composite Score range</i>	<i>Time Base</i>
Less than 10	0.3 AY
10 - 19.99	0.4 AY
20 - 29.99	0.5 AY
30 - 39.99	0.625 AY
40 - 49.99	0.8 AY
50 - 59.99	1.0 AY
More than 60	1.0 12-month

- II. It is critical to note that this method of determining chair support simply establishes a minimum assigned time FTE. Additional assigned time may be negotiated by each chair and should be supported by evidence of additional complexity, e.g., chairing a department with more than one major program (majors, not concentrations), housing a graduate program, external accreditation, having more than 400 majors, FTES above 500, running a facility or institute, having more than 50 faculty members (both temporary and tenure line), chairing a department that is not your home department, etc.
- III. Should it be agreed upon by the appropriate Dean and the department chair that the chair is to

receive less assigned time than that predicted by the above formula, an MOU must be agreed upon and signed by both parties.

- IV. Should the model predict a 12 month chair, this in fact would be a 12 month position, NOT an Academic Year position with two months of additional pay.

Implementation:

- I. The office of Institutional Effectiveness will determine the composite scores for each department based on the prior three year averages.
- II. The composite scores will be reevaluated every three years to ensure that each department chair's assigned time is regularly adjusted to changes in their metrics.
- III. The initial evaluation shall be completed by OIE during the Spring 2018 term such that chair appointments based on this policy will be assigned for a three year period, beginning with the Fall of 2018 term.
- IV. Should the initial evaluation indicate that a significant cost would be associated with the implementation of this policy, and should the anticipated budget be such that this cost warrant careful consideration before full implementation, this policy should be implemented according to the following schedule:

Implementation Date:	(Predicted FTE - Current FTE)
Fall 2018	> +0.10
Fall 2019	All others

procedure section: Issued: MM/DD/YYYY
Revised: MM/DD/YYYY
Edited: MM/DD/YYYY
Reviewed: MM/DD/YYYY