
Procedure	Faculty Evaluation of the Administration
------------------	---

Procedure Number:	102.40
Date Adopted:	1/17/80
Last Revision:	8/15/11, 9/21/17, 4/23/20
References:	Faculty Senate Articles and Bylaws (XIII- 3/18/82), CBA
Approved by:	Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

Introduction

The faculty evaluation of the administration normally occurs every other year. The purpose of the evaluation is to give faculty the opportunity to review job performance as it bears on matters of academic and administrative leadership. It is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all official responsibilities.

ECOS determines which administrators to review given time in office and interaction with faculty. Normally the President, Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, Academic Deans, the Chief Information Officer, and the Registrar are reviewed.

Method

A. Survey Questions

The Faculty Senate administrative associate obtains the most recent position description for the administrators to be evaluated. The administrators and their supervisors are asked whether there are specific goals or assessment criteria that should be included in the review questions. ECOS may discuss the administrative evaluation process at a leadership meeting to receive feedback from the administration. ECOS drafts a set of questions for each administrator based on prior years' surveys and any changes identified with the position description or assessment criteria for each administrator. Administrators are given a copy of the evaluation questions, their position description, and the draft communication to faculty in order to provide input for revisions as appropriate.

Faculty are asked to use a five-point scale to evaluate a number of performance dimensions. The effectiveness of the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and the Registrar are evaluated on several common dimensions (e.g., leadership, communication, overall effectiveness in their respective positions, diversity). In addition, each of the administrators is evaluated on other dimensions specific to their respective positions (e.g.,

finance, curriculum, and supervised services). There is a specific question or questions under each dimension. Faculty members also evaluate their own dean for recognizing, valuing, supporting and evaluating faculty, fundraising, relationship building, communication, budget management, retention and recruitment of faculty recruiting, culture, and overall performance satisfaction. In addition to completing the rating scales, faculty are given the option to provide written comments specific to the performance of each administrator.

B. Eligible Faculty

The Faculty Senate Office obtains a report of current faculty (as defined by Articles of the Faculty Senate [Article 1, Sec 1.] Retired faculty and faculty with FTE below .5 are removed from the list. The final list of eligible faculty is organized by academic unit (College or School) to enable the calculation of the appropriate response rate for each Academic Dean.

C. Survey Administration

To ensure the highest possible response rate, the President and the Provost may provide incentives to the faculty for completing the survey. For example, faculty completing the survey may be entered into a drawing.

The President, the Provost, and the Faculty Senate Chair prepare a joint message to eligible faculty stressing the importance participation in the electronic survey. The message is sent with the instructions to complete the evaluation by the deadline. The electronic survey includes links to the administrators' current position descriptions and specific goals and assessment criteria if available. Several follow-up messages are sent to faculty who have not yet participated.

Faculty are assured that their responses are strictly confidential and your identity will never be linked to your individual responses.

Data Compilation and Reporting

A. Reporting

Survey results are summarized for each administrator evaluated and include the written comments and comparative data from previous years when available. The summary provides a snapshot of the evaluation data. For each item, there are several lines describing the summarized data. The first line lists the frequency of responses for each of the five points on the scale, followed by the total number of responses and the mean. The second line lists these frequencies in terms of percentages. The third line lists the percentages and

the mean rating obtained in the prior survey (if available).

ECOS prepares an evaluation summary for each administrator based on the summarized data and the written comments. Comparisons with previous evaluations will provide guidance as to trends in the faculty's perception of administrator's performance.

The summary is provided to each administrator and their supervisor. The data points for the deans is provided in a summary chart. The other deans' identity is removed on the document provided to each dean.

B. Evaluation Feedback

ECOS discusses the evaluation results directly with those evaluated. The written review provided to the academic administrator shall address the evaluations received from faculty, and issues raised shall be addressed with the specific administrator under review. The Provost and President provide ECOS with an update of issues identified in the review.

Acceptance by Faculty Senate

After meeting with the administration, ECOS will provide senators secure access to the summary report. Senators also may view written comments by appointment at the Senate Office. After senators have the opportunity to review the summary report, the Chair will place a discussion of the evaluation results on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting. To ensure the privacy of those being evaluated, the Faculty Senate must vote to move into Executive Session (see Bylaws sec. E. Executive Session) before discussing the results of the report. The Faculty Senate then must vote to accept the Evaluation Report. Senators should provide a summary of the Evaluation Report to their constituencies to maintain transparent management of the university and to show appreciation for their participation in the evaluation process. The summary should be provided in a manner that protects the confidentiality of individual comments and restricts dissemination to faculty members only.

Disseminating the Faculty Evaluation of the Administration

After approval by the Faculty Senate, the Chair formally submits the Evaluation Report for the President, Provost, and Vice-Presidents to the Board of Regents and Commissioner of Higher Education with a cover letter stating the purpose and method of the faculty's evaluation and the limitations of those methods.

Timeline

1. Review and approval of eligible faculty list (Fall)
2. Development of questions (Fall)
3. Meet with Administrators (Fall)

4. Letter to faculty (Fall)
5. Follow-up to faculty not responding (Data collected by Dec)
6. ECOS writes reports and distributes to administrators and their supervisors (Jan-Feb)
7. ECOS gives each administrator the opportunity to discuss the evaluation report (Mar)
8. Faculty Senate approves report (April Faculty Senate meeting)
9. Senate Chair submits final Evaluation Report to President and Provost (April)
10. Senate Chair submits Evaluation Report to Commissioner and the Chair of Regents (May BOR meeting)
11. ECOS meets with the President and Provost for a feedback and utilization report (before June 1)