

# DRAFT Revision of the POLICY FOR FACULTY EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Faculty Document No. 2137R6

February 4, 2023

## PURPOSES

1. Provide formative information to administrators for the purpose of improving and evaluating performance.
2. Provide an avenue facilitating communication between faculty and administration by opening a forum that stimulates the independent expression of views of faculty members on administrative performance.
3. Provide faculty and ~~instructional~~ academic staff (with appointments of 50% or greater) input ~~to the appropriate appointing officer~~ concerning the performance of the Chancellor, the Provost/Vice Chancellor, ~~the Dean of the Graduate School~~ ~~the Vice Provost for Research~~, and the deans ~~and associate deans~~ of Colleges.
4. Exercise faculty governance.
5. Include administrators in the process of review analogous to what faculty experience.

## MEMBERSHIP

**Senate Subcommittee on the Evaluation of Administrators (SSEA).** Six members as follows: ~~four~~<sup>five</sup> faculty senators elected annually to staggered three-year terms and ~~two~~<sup>one</sup> ~~instructional~~ academic staff senators appointed annually by the Academic Staff Committee. No more than two ~~faculty~~ members shall be from a single ~~school~~, college, ~~or equivalent academic unit~~. No more than one ~~faculty~~ member shall be from a single department in a departmentalized school or college. Nominations and elections for the faculty members will take place at the May Faculty Senate meeting. The chair shall be a faculty member elected by the committee.

## PROCEDURES

*Please see original and clean copy of revision. A tracked changes document is not useful. Here the changes are described, with a short justification for each proposed change.*

- *All academic staff are proposed to be included in the evaluation, not just instructional academic staff.*

*Previously, advisers and administrative assistants were not included, even though they may have more relevant experience with administrators than many faculty.*

- *The proposal refers to the “Dean of the Graduate School” at all points rather than to the “Vice Provost of Research.”*

*The existing wording begged the question why just this Vice Provost should be evaluated as opposed to the others. The proposed wording clarifies that the Dean of the Graduate School will be evaluated along with deans of colleges.*

- *The proposed procedure no longer includes associate deans.*

*The former wording evaluated the associate deans with the dean which made the process more cumbersome. Furthermore, the associate deans serve at the pleasure of the deans and so adding this extra evaluation work has little useful effect. Individual colleges may adopt their own evaluation process for associate deans.*

- *In parallel with the inclusion of non-instructional staff, the committee would be resized to include two academic staff senators.*

*This change would permit both instructional and non-instructional views to be represented on the committee. It is intended that usually one academic staff senator would be instructional and one non-instructional, but for simplicity, this requirement was omitted.*

- *The proposed membership rule requires that staff and faculty not together be overly concentrated in one college or department. The former rules ignored the college homes of academic staff.*

*Especially since there would be two staff senators on the committee, it is important to ensure that the evaluators not be too concentrated in one college or department.*

- *The proposed procedure defines the constituents for the evaluation (the ones who will receive the questionnaire). The current policy says that the SSEA defines the group of constituents.*

*It provides better continuity and reduces confusion on the part of SSEA members to define the constituents in the policy.*

- *The frequency of evaluation is proposed to increase from every five years to every three years.*

*The intent is that the evaluation be useful for growth; waiting every five years for the first evaluation sometimes means a dean is never evaluated. Furthermore, by not including associate deans, and due to the college reorganization, every three years can be accommodated without too much work.*

- *The proposed policy makes it clear that the SSEA maintains questionnaires to be used for the various administrators; it is not expected that a novel questionnaire be developed for each evaluation.*

*The proposed policy allows for continuity by default, while still enabling changes as desired. This change gives each year’s SSEA more direction.*

- *The questionnaire would no longer asks the respondents to state their “satisfaction” but rather to include input on strengths and areas of growth of the administrator.*

*The revision follows the unchanged purpose to provide formative information to the administration. The purpose is to be constructive.*

- *The proposed policy adds the ability for the administrator to submit a self evaluation.*

*A self evaluation is part of many existing evaluation procedures, including for faculty and academic staff. Limiting it to two pages makes it more likely that people who are given the questionnaire will read the self evaluation.*

- *The proposed policy states that the questionnaire is to be distributed by November 1st and to be completed in two weeks.*

*The deadline is to provide more direction and to ensure that the evaluation can be carried out in a timely manner..*

- *The proposed policy clarifies that the evaluation report will contain aggregate numeric results and a summary of the written comments.*

*The revision makes it clear that the report should not include a listing of all the written comments, some of which are less helpful. Instead it would provide a summary.*

- *The proposed policy says that the members of the SSEA can make use of the prior evaluation when preparing their evaluation report.*

*The prior evaluation and especially the administrator's response can be useful to consult when preparing the current evaluation.*

- *The proposed policy clarifies that the administrator would have access to all the written comments from the questionnaire, even as the evaluation report contains only a summary.*

*It can be informative to have access, but the administrator is not required to read all of them. In the past, sometimes the written comments were not all constructive.*

- *The proposed policy gives the administrator two times to respond to the report: one to request changes, and one to indicate what actions have been or will be taken. The current policy has the appointing officer list actions, not the administrator being evaluated.*

*The proposed policy is more in line with evaluation of faculty and staff; it treats administrators as active players in their own development.*

- *The proposed policy stipulates that the summary of actions taken in response be attached as part of the evaluation report.*

*This change is in line with other evaluations done at the University.*

- *The current policy specifies how the report is distributed to constituents, appointing officers and the University Committee. The proposed policy leaves the details of secure distribution to the Secretary of the University's office.*

*The details are likely to need to change as technologies change. It seemed best to leave the details to a competent party.*