

SPECIAL REPORT
of the
RULES COMMITTEE
RELATING TO THE EVALUATION OF DEANS

Presented at the
394th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate
December 5, 1985

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

David Booth, Chair
Paul Mankin
Roland Chilton
Vincent Cleary
Oriol Pi-Sunyer
David Schimmel
Masha Rudman

Over the past several years, the Faculty Senate has frequently dealt with the issue of the evaluation of administrators. A careful review of past reports and of the records of the debates that invariably preceded the adoption of the motions, suggests that this is a matter that has generated a great deal of interest, careful thought, and measured debate.

The policy now in place is Senate Document 82-021, which was adopted by the Faculty Senate on December 3, 1981. To facilitate the Senate's deliberations, the document is attached to this report, as an appendix.

As far as can be ascertained, the policy is generally satisfactory, except with respect to deans. Last year, the Senate Secretary and the Chairman of the Rules Committee both received a number of complaints, alleging that some deans were not being evaluated. Accordingly, the Rules Committee discussed this matter to ascertain what should be done about it. Investigation revealed that one problem was the occasional unwillingness of the body charged with making the evaluation to discharge the obligation. As an explanation for this unwillingness, it was alleged that it was probably unrealistic to expect college of faculty personnel committees to undertake the laborious work of undertaking these demanding evaluations while working closely with the deans on routine personnel business.

Another problem that emerged has been the difficulty of keeping track of evaluations completed, as well as those that are scheduled in the future.

The Rules Committee has discussed this matter again and hopes that it may now have identified satisfactory solutions to both problems. As a means of solving the first problem, the Rules Committee proposes a change in the composition of the evaluating body.

As a means of solving the second problem, the Rules Committee proposes vesting responsibility for the scheduling of reviews of deans in the office of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (i.e., the Provost).

Because this is an important matter and one that needs to be carefully considered before any final action is taken, the Rules Committee has placed this matter on the agenda for discussion at one meeting, and it anticipates that final action will be delayed until the following meeting. The proposed motions are as follows:

MOVED: To amend paragraph B. of Senate Document No. 82-021 by deleting the words "the
11-86 School or College Personnel" and substituting therefore the following words "a committee of five faculty members chosen as follows:

One member chosen by the personnel committee from its own membership;

Two members appointed by the personnel committee, who are not members of the personnel committee;

The Provost shall designate one of the five members to serve as chairperson of the Committee.

The remainder of Paragraph B. (relating to the evaluation of the Graduate Dean, etc.) shall be amended to reflect the change in title, and shall be included in the revised document as a separate paragraph C.

The remaining paragraph shall be renumbered.

**MOVED:
12-86** To delete the word “personnel” in line 3 of paragraph 3A, to put in its place the word “evaluation,” and to add the following language as a new paragraph A under Section 2 of Sen. Doc. No. 82-021.

“The responsibility for the scheduling of reviews of deans shall be vested in the Provost’s Office. Not less than six months prior to the date of the scheduled evaluation, the Provost shall advise the person to be evaluated of the anticipated evaluation, and shall advise the Senate Secretary of his action.”

EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS

Evaluation Bodies

1. The several evaluations shall be conducted by the following groups:
 - A. Evaluation of Heads and Chairpersons shall be conducted by the Departmental Personnel Committee or by a mechanism voted by the Departmental faculty;
 - B. Evaluation of Academic Deans shall be conducted 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;
 - C. Evaluation of the Provost and the Chancellor shall be conducted 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 form the basis for the evaluation. These procedures, criteria, and questions shall 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;
 - 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 appended, from the person evaluated;
 - D. The written report, together with any appended comments, shall be distributed to the evaluatee and his/her administrative superior;

- 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 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.
 - B. The Provost and the Chancellor shall be evaluated during every fifth year in office.

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