Faculty Senate Procedures for Faculty Evaluation of Senior Administrators

Evaluation Schedule

The Provost and Deans will be evaluated by faculty in the third year following their initial appointment. An interim evaluation will commence 30 months after appointment and will be completed within six months. The interim evaluation may be treated by the Chancellor as informal and advisory in nature, but should become part of the record during periodic formal evaluation (Doc. T93-080) in the fifth year, and every two and a half years thereafter.

Rationale

a.) To provide faculty and students with a substantial and timely voice during the periodic formal evaluation cycle (Doc. T93-080);

b.) At regular intervals, to benchmark administrators' relationships with faculty and students, and their stewardships of their academic responsibilities;

c.) To provide academic administrators with accurate measures of opinion among faculty and students, so that academic administrators may more effectively discharge their duties.

Evaluation Bodies

For each senior administrator, an ad hoc Evaluation Committee (EC) will be formed. The members of the EC will be drawn at random from among all full-time faculty and professional librarians. There will be a public announcement of the time and place of the random drawing, so that any interested party may observe the proceedings. The procedure will be supervised by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The Chair of the EC will be selected by the members of the EC.

For the Provost, the EC will consist of two faculty from each Academic Council and one professional librarian. For Deans - other than the College of Arts and Sciences - the EC will consist of five faculty or librarians for the College or Library and one from outside the College or Library (total of six). In the College of Arts and Sciences there will be two faculty from each Academic Council within the College plus one faculty member from outside the College (total of seven). When the senior administrator under review oversees more than one academic department, there shall be no more than one member of the EC from any one department unless there is at least one member from each department. In cases where a second department faculty member is drawn at random before all departments are represented, that person’s name shall be returned to the pool and another name drawn.

Evaluation Procedure

Each evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the following procedures:

A. The Provost's office will inform the Faculty Senate when an academic administrator is due for evaluation.

B. In advance of the evaluation, the EC shall adopt a written set of procedures, which shall form the basis for the evaluation. These procedures shall include:
i. An evaluation form to be submitted to every full-time faculty member within that administrator's jurisdiction. The evaluation form shall be one component in the evaluation process and while great emphasis should be placed on it, the EC is not limited to the evidence it produces. In addition to the general qualities mentioned in Doc. T93-080 (leadership, policy development, management and administration, personnel, and affirmative action/diversity) the evaluation form of each academic administrator shall contain a place for faculty to comment on the administrator's efforts in facilitating the following qualities:

1. Institutional development and leadership
2. Recruitment and development of faculty and professional staff, improvement in quality of faculty and staff
3. Efforts to increase diversity and pluralism among student, faculty and professional staff
4. Encouragement and support for teaching, student advisement, research, university and community service
5. Interaction with other relevant constituencies
6. Grants and other external funding
7. Openness in communication and interchange with faculty
8. Fostering faculty and other professional collaboration
9. Fostering innovation, including innovation in technology
10. Fostering teaching with technology
11. Timeliness in processing paperwork
12. Effectiveness, transparency and fairness in budget creation and allocation
13. Outreach to other constituencies external to the college and university
14. Personal professional development including publications, awards, lectures, art exhibits, recitals, et al.

ii. Method for the solicitation of student opinion, both graduate and undergraduate.

C. The person to be evaluated will be invited to prepare a written statement of administrative achievements to be submitted to the EC.

D. The evaluation shall be confidential, and committee members shall be charged by the Senate President and Steering Committee to respect the confidentiality of the process.

E. Each EC shall prepare a written report and shall invite written comments to be appended from the person evaluated. In cases where the members of the EC have divergent assessments of the administrator's performance, members will have the opportunity to produce a minority report that will accompany the main report.

F. In the case of the Provost, the faculty evaluation committee will coordinate their work with the Chancellor; in the case of the Deans, their work will be coordinated with the Provost.

G. The written report, together with appended comments, shall be distributed to the individual evaluated and to the Provost in the case of the Deans, and to the Chancellor in the case of the Provost.
H. While the evaluation is in progress, the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate shall check to see that the evaluation by the faculty is being accomplished according to the stipulated guidelines. The EC shall inform the Steering Committee of its progress on a monthly basis.

I. Each EC shall inform the Faculty Senate when it is completed and shall deliver its report to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Chancellor in the case of evaluation of the Provost, and to the Provost in the case of evaluation of Deans.