

EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS AND SCHOOL DEANS

Senate Administrative Policy Committee

Gerard Caneba

Mary Babcock

Shezwae Fleming

Kelly Kallio

Madhukar Vable---Chair

Current Procedure

- Two separate procedures for review of School Dean and Department Chair under the same number.

Senators of Departments (Schools) would vote on modification made to those for School Deans (Department Chairs) even though they were unaffected by it.

- Contradictory statements
- Statements of search procedures incorporated into review process.

Appendix B shows the old proposal with various problems and solutions identified.

New Proposal

- Contradictory statements have been removed.
- Clean lines of implementation and tries to use old proposal language when possible.
- A single procedure is used for Department Chairs and School Deans.
- The survey instrument now has three sets of questions.
 1. A set specified by College Dean for all departments in the college, or by Provost for all the schools.
 2. A set chosen by the review committee (as before) of the academic unit.
 3. Two questions chosen by the Administrator being reviewed.
- A separate procedure (707.1.1) for conducting survey and ballot that is significantly more confidential and anonymous which should help in increasing participation in the review process.
- Language approved by the Senate for implementation of the result.

Steps in the Procedure

1. Initiated by College Dean for departments and by Provost for schools.
2. Committee & voting constituency defined as per unit Charter.
3. First meeting of committee called by college Dean/Provost and important documents given to the committee including the Unit Administrator's self-evaluation report.
4. Survey instrument designed and the survey conducted by the Senate Administrative Assistant (SAA) and results returned to the committee.
5. Committee writes a report, shows and gets a rebuttal from unit administrator and calls a unit meeting to look at the report.
6. Ballot for reappointment conducted by SAA and unit constituency and Unit Administrator informed of the results.
7. Report & Ballot results send to college Dean/Provost.
8. Dean/Provost writes his/her report and discusses the report and recommendation with the unit administrator and the whole package moves through the administrative structure to the University President. Implementation of results as per Senate Motion.
9. Unit meeting is called and Dean/Provost discuss the evaluation.

Implementation of survey results.

Approved Senate Motion

When the administration decides to reappoint a department chair or a school dean contrary to a majority of the voting constituency of either faculty or staff, the College Dean or the Provost will provide written explanation of the reasons for that decision to the members of the academic unit.

If two-thirds majority of the voting constituency of either faculty or staff, votes not to reappoint a department chair or a school dean, the administration will honor the decision of the academic unit.

A compromise

When the administration decides to reappoint a department chair or a school dean contrary to a majority of the voting constituency of either faculty or staff, the College Dean or the Provost will provide written explanation of the reasons for that decision to the members of the academic unit.

*If two-thirds majority of the voting constituency of either faculty or staff, votes not to reappoint a department chair or a school dean, the administration will **normally** honor the decision of the academic unit. When the administration decides contrary to a 2/3 majority vote, the College Dean or the Provost will provide written explanation of the reasons for that decision to the members of the department/school.*

Adapting the reappointment process to act as feedback

III Frequency of Review

...

The evaluation process also may be initiated by the College Dean/Provost or by the faculty (by a simple majority vote) at any time earlier, but not more than once a year.

....

- There is a desire to modify the above statement so that the reappointment procedure can be used for purpose of feedback for a new unit administrator by deleting the ballot for reappointment.----
Jury rigging has problems.

Feedback can be better achieved in one of the two ways.

1. The Dean or Provost can send the survey instrument and list of e-mail directly to Senate Administrative Assistant (SAA), who can conduct the survey and send the results back.
2. We can design a separate proposal for annual review in which statistical results are sent to the College Dean or Provost, and the entire package including the comments back to the Unit Administrator. Similar to student evaluation of faculty.

Procedure for reappointment without the ballot.

1. Initiated by College Dean for departments and by Provost for schools.
 2. Committee & voting constituency defined as per unit Charter.
 3. First meeting of committee called by college Dean/Provost and important documents given to the committee including the Unit Administrator's self-evaluation report.
 4. Survey instrument designed and the survey conducted by the Senate Administrative Assistant (SAA) and results returned to the committee.
 5. Committee writes a report, shows and gets a rebuttal from unit administrator and calls a unit meeting to look at the report.
- Question 1: Why are faculty and staff looking at the report?
 - Question 2: Will the dissemination of report cause embarrassment and entrench existing perceptions? Will this not defeat the original intent of helping a new Unit Administrator?
 - Question 3: If we delete writing of the report then the procedure is only conducting a survey using the a faculty and staff committee. What is the advantage of committee over Dean / Provost conducting it directly? Both will use SAA to conduct the survey.