

SPECIAL REPORT

of the

RULES COMMITTEE

concerning

EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

Presented at the

338th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate

December 3, 1981

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

**Dean Alfange
Jay Demerath
Micheline Dufau
Sylvia Forman, Chair
Paul H. Jennings
Fern Johnson
Otto Stein**

EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

INTRODUCTION

1. In recent years faculty members have invested a significant amount of time at departmental, college and campus level in the evaluation of academic administrators. This investment was accepted because (a) it provided an avenue for faculty influence in the University's affairs, (b) it provided administrators with specific assessments of their performance, (c) it represented the possibility of encouraging behavioral changes, where they were appropriate, and (d) it represented the possibility of influencing subsequent personnel actions concerning academic administrators. The reasons which persuaded the faculty to seek this system of evaluation were later succinctly expressed by the Commission on Missions and Goals in 1976: "In our view a first-rate university benefits from being administered by intellectual leaders of stature subject to periodic evaluation by the faculty."

2. The policy of periodically evaluating Heads and Chairpersons was formally adopted by the Board of Trustees, at the urging of the Faculty Senate, in 1970 (Trustee Document T70-62A). In 1974, by agreement between the Faculty Senate and the campus administration, this system of evaluation was extended to cover Academic Deans and the Provost, and a regular schedule of evaluations was established (Provost's memorandum P77-F10). In February 1977 the Provost suspended these arrangements for evaluation. Since that time the opportunity for faculty evaluation of academic administrators has been limited to the ad hoc evaluations of Chancellor and President undertaken by the Faculty Senate in the Spring of 1977.

3. The Rules Committee, which is persuaded of the merits of these evaluations, reopened the matter in discussions with the Chancellor and the Provost in the Fall Semester, 1977, indicating its belief in the value of evaluations both for the institution and the individual administrator. Subsequently the Chancellor summarized his position in a memorandum dated November 25, 1977:

- A. Notwithstanding the ambiguities of recent bargaining unit determination elections, the Administration was willing that Trustee-mandated evaluation of heads and chairpersons continue, provided that these evaluations are not precluded by subsequent collective bargaining agreements. However, in order to reserve the Administration's position in collective bargaining negotiations, the Provost will not issue new guidelines.
- B. Similarly, in order to reserve the Administration's position in collective bargaining negotiations, the Administration will not issue new guidelines for the evaluation of administrators above the department level and retains the right to decide on the use to be made of any such evaluation.

4. On April 13, 1978, the Faculty Senate approved the arrangements for evaluation of administrators as described in Sen. Doc. No. 78-041 (as amended). Since that time collective bargaining has been adopted by the Faculty and many administrative positions on campus have undergone a change in personnel. As a result, the Rules Committee felt that existing procedures should be re-evaluated in light of experience gained with the present guide lines and changes proposed where they seem appropriate. The Evaluation Arrangements presented below are those described in Sen. Doc. No. 78-041 (as amended) with proposed additions underlined and deletions noted by slash marks (/). This proposal is submitted for the Senate's consideration in the knowledge that collective bargaining agreements and reorganization of Public Higher Education in the Commonwealth may ultimately require modification of any arrangements made at this time.

EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS

Evaluation Bodies

1. The several evaluations shall be conducted by the following groups:
 - A. Evaluation of Heads and Chairpersons shall be conducted ~~evaluated~~ by the Departmental Personnel Committee or by a mechanism voted by the Departmental faculty;
 - B. Evaluation of Academic Deans shall be conducted ~~evaluated~~ by the School or College Personnel Committee, except that the responsibility for conducting the evaluation of the Graduate Dean shall rest with the Graduate Council and the Research Council; conduct of the evaluation of the Director of the Library shall be the joint responsibility of the Library Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Library Personnel Committee. ~~specified in Article 20.1 of the Agreement between MSP/FSU/MTA/NEEA and the Board of Trustees; and~~
 - C. Evaluation of the Provost, and the Chancellor ~~and the President~~ shall be conducted ~~evaluated~~ by ad hoc committees nominated by the Committee on Committees and ratified by the Faculty Senate.
 - D. Where the evaluation of the President is concerned, the Faculty Senate stands ready to contribute to any process established for that purpose involving the individual campuses.

Evaluation Procedures

2. The several evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedures:
 - A. In advance of the evaluation, in analogy with the Annual Faculty Report, the person to be evaluated shall have the opportunity to prepare a written statement of administrative achievements to be submitted to the evaluation body;
 - B. Each evaluating body shall adopt a written set of procedures, criteria, and/or evaluating questions which shall ~~should~~ form the basis for the evaluation. These procedures, criteria, and questions shall ~~should~~ include:
 - i. a means to solicit faculty opinion;
 - ii. a means to solicit student opinion, both at the graduate and undergraduate level;
 - iii. a means to solicit the opinions of the subject's administrative superiors and, if appropriate, subordinates; ~~and~~
 - iv. a means to solicit opinions of other relevant constituencies; and
 - v. a means to preserve the confidentiality of the evaluation data.
 - C. Each evaluating body shall prepare a written report and shall invite written comments, to be ~~appe~~ added, from the person evaluated.

- D. The written report, together with any appended comments, shall be distributed to the evaluatee and his/her administrative superior. ~~of the person being evaluated.~~ The superior shall received an additional copy for inclusion in the personnel file, in analogy with the annual evaluations of faculty members.
- E. ~~Evaluating bodies shall should ordinarily address the question of continuation or non-continuation in office of the individual under evaluation.~~
- E. Each evaluation committee shall inform the Senate Secretary when it has completed its task.

Schedule of Evaluations

3. The frequency of evaluations shall be as follows:

A. ~~Heads, Chairpersons, and the Academic Deans and the Provost shall be evaluated during every third year in office, but not less than one year. It shall be the responsibility of the appropriate Personnel Committee to initiate the review of an academic administrator, during the third year in office. By petition of the majority of the departmental faculty (in the case of a Head or Chairperson) or of one third of the faculty of a School, College or Faculty (in the case of a Dean), or of one fifth of the General Faculty (in the case of the Provost) an evaluation may be requested at any time, provided no evaluation has been conducted in the previous year.~~

A. Heads/Chairpersons shall be evaluated during every third year in office and Academic Deans shall be evaluated during every fourth year in office. It shall be the responsibility of the appropriate Personnel Committee to initiate the review. By petition of the majority of the departmental faculty (in the case of a Head or a Chairperson) or of one - third of the faculty of a School, College or Faculty (in the case of a Dean) an evaluation may be requested at any time.

~~In the case of new appointments, evaluations shall ordinarily commence in the third year after the date of appointment.~~

B. ~~The Provost, and the Chancellor and the President shall be evaluated at intervals of not more than four years, but not less than three years. during every fifth year in office.~~

~~At other times~~ An evaluation may also be called for by a vote of at least two-thirds of the Faculty Senate, at a Regular Meeting, upon petition by at least one -fifth of the General Faculty.

~~In the case of new appointments evaluations shall ordinarily commence in the fourth year after the date of appointment.~~

C. ~~In all cases a delay in evaluation of up to one year may be arranged, when deemed advisable, by agreement between the evaluating body and the administrative superior of the person to be evaluated.~~

4. These Evaluation Arrangements, upon approval by the Faculty Senate, will supersede those Arrangements contained in Sen. Doc. No. 78-041 (as amended).

MOTION

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the arrangements for the evaluation of academic administrators as described in Sen. Doc. No. 82-021.
13-82