



Rutgers University Senate
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC)

**Response to Charge A-0812: Evaluation of Administrators
Part I: Evaluation of Academic Deans**

A. Charge

A-0812: Evaluate the current procedures for faculty, staff and student evaluation of deans since implementation in 2004. Recommend changes where appropriate, and examine the feasibility of extending the process to include vice presidents and other administrators.

B. Procedure

The FPAC opted to separate the part of the charge on the evaluation of deans from the issue of extending the process to include vice presidents and other administrators, including the president. The latter part of the charge is completely new for Rutgers, and research at peer institutions unveiled a plethora of approaches ranging from completely confidential reports to annual numerical assessment values published on the web. In the meantime, there are decanal reviews coming up and the FPAC, responding to the need of the administration for a timely new policy would not like to delay the part dealing with decanal evaluations. This is the object of the current report.

C. Summary

As elaborated upon below, this is the third iteration of the policy for the evaluation of deans. There are two significant changes from the current policy (adopted in 2004) that are recommended by the FPAC:

- to make the survey instrument mandatory for all evaluations
- to shift the timing of the first evaluation for newly appointed deans at a time earlier than five years, while retaining the period of the cycle at five years.

D. History: the 2001 and 2004 policies

The procedure for the evaluation of administrators by faculty, staff and students was first proposed by the New Brunswick Faculty Council and its Personnel Policy Committee (PPC) which, in March of 2000, recommended that its PPC, other faculty governance, and the administration develop a review system for evaluating, at a minimum, all faculty administrators (e.g., directors, deans) and others whose performance impacts teaching, research and service. The NBFC communicated their resolution to the University Senate, which then issued a charge to the then-called Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee (FAPC), currently renamed Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC).

The FAPC developed a policy that was adopted by the Senate, and then-President Lawrence, in March of 2001. This 2001 policy had the following major features:

- Reviewers would be faculty, administrators and students, as well as possibly individuals from outside the unit or the university.
- The ad hoc evaluation committee would choose the appropriate structure with input from the largest group available.
- A survey was mandated with the use of a scanned rating form similar to the Student Instructional Rating Forms (SIRFs).
- Review timing no less frequently than every five years with no other review triggering allowed.
- Stated purpose was “.... to provide input to the supervising administrator of the reviewee as to his/her performance.”

The feeling among the university community, and the assessment of the FPAC, from experience of six completed evaluations during two different administrations, was that the process of evaluation of deans at Rutgers University needed substantial overhaul if it was to be taken seriously. The experience of these six evaluations had left both deans and evaluators with varying degrees of frustration in what was generally perceived as an exercise in futility. Under the 2001 policy, the results of the evaluation were strictly confidential and were communicated only to the dean’s supervisor, the president, the dean and the chair of the University Senate. The results of the evaluation were apparently not only not acted upon but were not even communicated in any detail to the deans under evaluation. In addition, no decanal reviews were carried out in either Camden or Newark.

President McCormick and Executive Vice President Furmanski assured the FAPC that the new administration welcomed a process and was willing to take it seriously into account provided the process was tailored in a way that made the results more reliable and the evaluation more comprehensive¹. The committee met with the President, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA) and the provosts, and used their input to formulate the new policy that was adopted in March of 2004. This 2004 policy has the following features:

- A more thorough evaluation process (beyond a survey) is to be carried out by an ad hoc committee formed by the president or the dean’s supervisor with input from the appropriate constituency bodies.
- An all-inclusive survey is not mandated in the 2004 policy, although it was the one part of the 2001 policy that had met with wide satisfaction. The 2001-policy process that called for a survey carried out by an elected faculty committee may or may not be part of the evaluation. That decision along with

¹ The point was made in particular that “a survey is not an evaluation.”

the other decisions on evaluation format, is left to the discretion of the committee and the individual unit.

- Decisions on format and manner of the evaluation are similarly left to committees of the individual units. The evaluation committee is charged by the dean's supervisor, and devises a plan for the evaluation with input from the appropriate constituency bodies. The plan and its details are approved by these bodies before the evaluation commences.
- The process mandates that the evaluation committee provide some feedback to the appropriate constituencies on the results of the evaluation.
- The process also mandates that there be some feedback from the administration to the faculty on policy changes stemming from the process.
- The stated goal of the evaluation is to improve the performance of the individual being reviewed. Still, it is expected that the evaluation will become part of the individual's personnel file and will provide input to the supervisor on personnel decisions. Taken collectively, these evaluations should be useful in identifying institutional weaknesses.

Five deans, as well as the University Librarian, were evaluated under the 2004 policy. In addition, one more evaluation was aborted due to the resignation of the dean. Another five scheduled evaluations were not carried out because of resignation announcements by the deans who were scheduled for review.

It is the opinion of the FPAC that the evaluation process, as implemented by the current administration and the 2004 policy, is a substantial improvement from the previous experience. The EVPAA states that the evaluations are taken seriously, and every indication, including some, but not all, of the above resignations suggest that it is indeed so. One aspect, however, where the 2004 policy is a step backward from the 2001 policy is the amount of time the process seems to now take, which is invariably more than a semester, and on occasion more than a year.

The EVPAA asked his staff for a review of the evaluation process. That was carried out by interviews of the chairs of the ad hoc evaluation committees and meetings with the co-chairs of the FPAC to communicate the findings and ask for an amendment to the policy².

² Hence the charge carries an "A" prefix designating that it was initiated by the Administration.

E. Discussion and Recommendations

The FPAC discussed the charge during six meetings: February, March, September, October and December 2009 and January 2010.

Documents used include the 2001 policy (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/adminrev.html>), the current, 2004 policy (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/fapadminreview.html>) and the *Draft Statement on Revised University Senate Procedures for Evaluation of Administrators* produced by the office of the EVPAA, included in this report as Appendix I, hereafter being referred to as the *Draft Statement*.

The recommendations for the 2004 policy were formulated as amendments to the 2001 policy. Most seemed to work, according to the testimonials collected and reiterated in the *Draft Statement*. The procedures for the 2004 policy are reiterated below:

1. *The normal evaluation cycle should be five years but an evaluation can be triggered at any time by the dean's supervisor, by the dean, or by the unit's faculty. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the unit's tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students of the unit, to the faculty secretary of the unit, or equivalent person, triggers a secret ballot docketed for the next faculty meeting where the question of whether to have an out-of-cycle evaluation of the dean to commence at the current semester is decided by majority vote of those voting. An evaluation by petition can only be requested once between regular evaluations.*
2. *The dean's supervisor will meet with the faculty unit and the dean to initiate the process.*
3. *The University Senate will be informed by the dean's supervisor in case of major delays or irregularities.*
4. *An ad hoc Dean Evaluation Committee (DEC), the majority of which must be faculty members³, will be formed by the dean's supervisor and/or the president, as follows:*
 - 4a. *The appropriate governance body of the unit will submit a slate of ten faculty members³ or 50% of the faculty, whichever is smaller, from within the unit, from which three will be chosen.*
 - 4b. *The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit a slate of eight faculty members³ from without the unit, from which two will be chosen. Faculty from related units should be preferred in the composition of the slate.*
 - 4c. *Up to three administrators can be appointed by the dean's supervisor.*
5. *The DEC will meet as a body to elect its chair.*
6. *The DEC, in consultation with the dean's supervisor, will decide on whether to include in its membership representatives from among the staff, students, alumni, or other constituencies (from within or without the unit or even the university) with whom the dean may have substantial contact. In so doing, the DEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty³. The DEC will also decide on the manner of choosing such members. In the case of student membership, the student representative(s) should be chosen from among student senators representing the unit, and/or officers of the appropriate student governing association.*
7. *The DEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the dean and the dean's supervisor. In so doing, the committee shall enjoy significant latitude, but will*

³ Who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors

need to ensure that meaningful faculty, student and staff input is received, and that the process provides for anonymity for respondents who request it. Furthermore, in addition to any unit-specific questions or criteria, DEC's will include in the review process evaluations of the dean in the following areas, as appropriate to the individual unit:

- * Quality of relationship with, and care for, students*
- * Quality of collegial relationship between the dean and the faculty and/or fellows*
- * Performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff*
- * Performance of financial and strategic management of the unit's resources*
- * Overall performance*

- 8. The DEC should specifically address the question of whether there should or should not be a survey in which all faculty and staff would have input. It will also decide on the constituencies to be polled (expected to vary among units). It is also expected that input from students, PTLs and annuals will be solicited.*
- 9. The DEC will present the plan to the dean's supervisor and the appropriate constituency body of the unit for approval. The faculty of the unit which the dean heads will specifically vote on whether a survey will be conducted as part of the evaluation. If the faculty of the unit wish to modify the evaluation plan proposed by the DEC, they will return the proposal to the DEC, specifying their concerns and how they would like them to be addressed. Should the DEC decide not to accept the faculty's proposed changes, it will provide the faculty with written reasons for its decision. If a survey becomes part of the evaluation, then:*
 - 9a. A survey should be formulated by the DEC. Provision should be made for narrative comments as well as a series of multiple-choice evaluations. The multiple-choice evaluations will include the five performance areas listed above plus any unit-specific additions from the unit faculty. Analysis of the data will be programmed so that means and other statistics will be standard outputs, along with anonymous listing of the narrative comments. This summary of respondents' input is all that will be made available to those having access to survey results. The system must provide privacy assurances for the faculty, students and other respondents. Use of a paper survey is recommended, but for units using an online survey, nonelectronic copies of the survey instrument will be provided to faculty, students or staff who do not wish to participate in the electronic version, and the DEC will need to determine how to protect the confidentiality of those respondents and how to ensure that their views are included in the overall evaluation. Response rates for the survey by type of respondent (tenured and tenure-track faculty, other faculty, student, administrative and non-administrative staff, other) should be reported along with the survey results.*

Units may wish to collect additional data, such as:

- * Respondent's familiarity with dean's performance in position*
- * Quality of faculty and program development*
- * Fairness and ethics*
- * Leadership*
- * Communication*
- * Functional Competence*
- * Commitment to Diversity*

** Interpersonal Skills*

9b. *The survey will be carried out by the Teaching Excellence Center (TEC); numerical results will be tabulated by the TEC as will the written comments.*

9c. *The committee or an external sub-committee will write a summary of the written comments and will correlate them with the numerical results (if any).*

If a survey is not part of the evaluation, then the DEC should provide a venue for any faculty member who wishes to provide input with guarantees of anonymity.

10. *A thorough evaluation process should be carried out by the DEC. Additional input could include discussion summarized in narrative form (similar to departmental narratives used in faculty personnel decisions), or letters and communications from individuals commenting on the dean's performance, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved, if desired by those respondents. Units are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The dean's supervisor is encouraged to make available some secretarial support to the DEC.*

11. *Once completed, the report of the DEC shall be sent to the dean, along with a request for a written response. The DEC will append the response of the dean to its report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute the five copies to the president, the EVPAA, the dean's supervisor, the dean and the chair of the University Senate. It is expected that the results will be confidential and that those with access to the results will respect that confidentiality.*

12. *The DEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty of the unit. The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the DEC. It is suggested that, if a survey is part of the review process, then some results of the survey be part of the feedback summary. The dean's supervisor should have the opportunity to suggest changes to the summary to the committee.*

13. *The supervisor should meet with the dean to discuss the evaluation.*

14. *The supervisor should then meet with the dean and the faculty to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to unit policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.*

Clarifications were requested for recommendations 7, 9, 11 and 12. The FPAC recommends the following:

The first two sentences of recommendation 7 are amended so that it now reads (addition in italics):

7. The DEC will then meet, and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the dean and the dean's supervisor. In so doing, the committee shall enjoy significant latitude, but will need to ensure that meaningful faculty, student and staff input is received *during the evaluation process*, and that the process provides for anonymity for respondents who request it.

The first sentence of recommendation 2 is augmented by a second sentence, as follows:

2. The dean's supervisor will meet with the faculty unit and the dean to initiate the process. In most cases, the unit faculty will also be the "appropriate constituency body," In units where the

faculty do not regularly meet as a body, an appropriately representative body shall be identified by the EVPAA to the unit faculty at the onset of the evaluation process.

Recommendation 11 is amended with the following additions (in italics) and deletions (strikeout):

11. Once completed, the report of the DEC shall be sent to the dean, along with a request for a written response. The DEC *will have access to the dean's response but will not act on it. The DEC* will append the response of the dean to its report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute ~~the five copies~~ *one copy each* to the president, the EVPAA, the dean's supervisor, *if other than the EVPAA*, ~~the dean~~ and the chair of the University Senate. It is expected that the results will be confidential and that those with access to the results will respect that confidentiality.

Recommendation 12 is amended with the following additions (in italics) and deletions (strikeout):

12. The DEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty of the unit. *In preparing this summary, the DEC may also wish to summarize the response of the dean.* The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the DEC. It is suggested that, ~~if a survey is part of the review process, then~~ some results of the survey be part of the feedback summary. The dean's supervisor should have the opportunity to suggest changes to the summary to the committee. *The DEC will decide whether there should be feedback to other constituencies that have provided input to the evaluation and on the content of this feedback.*

The FPAC considered the larger process changes recommended by the *Draft Statement* and recommends the following:

Insert an additional item between current recommendations 6 and 7 as follows:

The dean will be asked by the EVPAA to submit to the committee within a reasonable time scale a statement detailing responsibilities and accomplishments that will include data as well as his/her vision and strategic plan for the unit. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the DEC. The dean's statement should be made available to those providing input to the process.

Item 9b states:

9b. The survey will be carried out by the Teaching Excellence Center (TEC); numerical results will be tabulated by the TEC as will the written comments.

For "TEC" (currently CTAAR), those who are familiar with these evaluations realize that the reference is to Dr. Monica Devanas. Indeed, her contribution in evaluating the data and informing DEC members on the extent data are statistically significant or not has been invaluable. However, the Senate never intended to put the onus of preparing complete evaluation reports on the staff of CTAAR. This task must be reserved for the committee in general, and the chair of the DEC in particular. As with any other academic

committee, anyone accepting the role of committee chair should expect to shoulder the bulk of the task of expressing the views of the committee in a report format. Thus we propose to amend item 9b as follows:

9b. The survey will be carried out by the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTAAR). Numerical results will be tabulated by ~~the TEC~~ CTAAR, as will the written comments. Nevertheless, evaluating the data and formulating the report is the task of the DEC.

The major recommendation stemming from the findings in the *Draft Statement* is for a survey to be mandatory. The committee believes that it would be too much of a swing to the opposite direction to provide a questionnaire, and suggests that each DEC peruse previously used questionnaires, and then adapt the most appropriate for their unit. Since the main form of faculty input, namely the survey, is now required, and in order to save time and reduce the complexity of the process, the DEC will not be required to present an evaluation plan to the faculty for approval. Thus, recommendations 8 and 9 should be deleted (but not 9a, 9b and 9c). The comment on input from PTLs and annuals should be transferred to another recommendation.

An additional issue was raised by members of the Council of Deans through the FPAC's administrative liaison:

At other peer AAUs (U. Iowa, U. Minnesota, U. Kansas, U. Texas et al) the question of the review is often whether "*the dean should be encouraged to continue to serve as the leader of this academic unit.*" Deans and other administrators at Rutgers serve at the pleasure of the president, and reappointment as such does not exist. The administration sees the purpose of the review as a means to improve performance of the reviewed individual. Nevertheless, the current policy provides faculty with a less radical mechanism for indicating concerns than a vote of "*no confidence.*" The current policy leaves charging of the evaluating committee to the president and/or the dean's supervisor, with the expectation that the question of reappointment will not be part of such charging, but also allows for the initiation of the process "off-cycle" by petition of the unit's faculty.

Evaluation of deans by their supervisor takes place every year, with a major evaluation every five years. The latter is, in all practical purposes, akin to reappointment. To further dissociate the evaluation from personnel decisions, it was suggested that the evaluation by faculty, staff and students continue to take place in a 5-year cycle, but is initiated at an earlier year when it is the first evaluation. This has the additional advantage that any perceived weaknesses can be addressed before the 5-year supervisor review and improvement, or lack thereof, can be assessed at that point. Most believed that if the process is, indeed, formative, separating the evaluation cycle from the contract period is also a good notion. Thus, the FPAC agreed with a "phase difference" between the evaluations and the 5-year supervisor reviews, but was split with respect to recommending when this should occur. Three years was deemed by some as too early, and four years by others as not leaving enough time for the dean to act on perceived areas of weakness. The view for year 4 won the vote, however other arguments were also convincing⁴. The

⁴ Some commented that deans with an effective staff would hear of dissatisfaction in the unit, and the notion of going through an evaluation process after 3 years is premature. Others felt that daily grumbling about deans is noise; an evaluation at 3 years is more of a formal signal. A committee member that was a dean elsewhere, felt that most deans have a sense of what is going on and an evaluation at 5 years is fine. Most agreed that deans should have the opportunity to act on feedback; it was not clear if this could be achieved with an evaluation at year 4.

recommendation is formulated in a way that will leave it flexible, the decision to be made by the EVPAA based on actual experience.

Further disassociating the evaluation from personnel decisions should also result in more communication of the evaluation results to the faculty from the DEC. Indeed, among eleven peer AAUs, five make everything on the report public, five make it confidential, and one is in between. It is interesting, however, to note that there is a correlation between confidentiality and use of the evaluation: evaluations tend to be confidential in those institutions where the evaluation is primarily used for reappointment decisions (not the case at Rutgers). This suggestion is incorporated in recommendation 12.

F. Recommendation for a third iteration on the policy to govern the review of deans by faculty, staff and students

The committee proposes the amendment of the current process that involves faculty, student, and other input for the regular review of all deans with line authority in the University. The amended process still includes all deans reporting directly to the chancellors, or to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. Each such dean shall normally be evaluated by this process every five years, in order to provide input to the supervising administrator of the dean under review as to his/her performance with the first such evaluation taking place at least a year before the first 5-yearly review by the supervisor.

The committee reiterates that this process is not intended to be a replacement of the annual evaluations of deans done by their supervising administrators, but to be an additional source of data to aid in that process. The information and views gathered during the evaluation process will be used by the supervisor of the deans. Results should be used to provide feedback to the dean on his or her areas of strength and areas in which development may be needed. Correlation of results may be useful in identifying institutional weaknesses. It is also expected that, even if the question of reappointment is not the central goal of the review, an exceptionally negative review should be taken strongly into account for an appropriate personnel decision.

By incorporating the above changes and renumbering as appropriate the recommendations from the 2004 policy, the committee recommends the following third iteration, to constitute the 2010 policy:

- 1. Each academic dean shall normally be evaluated by faculty, staff and students in the unit every five years, but an evaluation can be triggered at any time by the dean's supervisor, by the dean, or by the unit's faculty. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the unit's tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students of the unit, to the faculty secretary of the unit, or equivalent person, triggers a secret ballot docketed for the next faculty meeting where the question of whether to have an out-of-cycle evaluation of the dean, to commence at the current semester, is decided by majority vote of those voting. An evaluation by petition can only be requested once between regular evaluations.**
- 2. The initial evaluation for newly appointed deans should be earlier than the fifth year so that evaluations by faculty, staff and students should not coincide with the 5-yearly review by the dean's supervisor. Such evaluations should be carried out in year 4, if this would allow enough time for the deans to act on suggestions resulting from the evaluation. A single semester should normally suffice for completion of the evaluation.**

3. **The dean's supervisor will meet with the unit faculty and the dean to initiate the process. In most cases, the unit faculty will also be the "appropriate constituency body." In units where the faculty do not regularly meet as a body, an appropriately representative body shall be identified by the EVPAA to the unit faculty at the onset of the evaluation process.**
4. **The University Senate will be informed by the dean's supervisor in case of major delays or irregularities.**
5. **An ad hoc Dean Evaluation Committee (DEC), the majority of which must be faculty members⁵, will be formed by the dean's supervisor and/or the president, as follows:**
 - 5a. **The appropriate governance body of the unit will submit a slate of ten faculty members⁵ or 50% of the faculty, whichever is smaller, from within the unit, from which three will be chosen.**
 - 5b. **The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit a slate of eight faculty members⁵ from without the unit, from which two will be chosen. Faculty from related units should be preferred in the composition of the slate.**
 - 5c. **Up to three administrators can be appointed by the dean's supervisor.**
6. **The DEC will meet as a body to elect its chair.**
7. **The dean will be asked by the EVPAA to submit to the committee, within a reasonable time scale, a statement detailing responsibilities and accomplishments that will include data as well as his/her vision and strategic plan for the unit. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the DEC. The dean's statement should be made available to those providing input to the process.**
8. **The DEC, in consultation with the dean's supervisor, will decide on whether to include in its membership representatives from among the staff, students, alumni, or other constituencies (from within or without the unit or even the university) with whom the dean may have substantial contact. In so doing, the DEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty⁵. The DEC will also decide on the manner of choosing such members. In the case of student membership, the student representative(s) should be chosen from among student senators representing the unit, and/or officers of the appropriate student governing association.**
9. **The DEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the dean and the dean's supervisor. In so doing, the committee shall enjoy significant latitude, but will need to ensure that meaningful faculty (including PTLs and annuals), student and staff input is received during the evaluation process, and that the process provides for anonymity of respondents who request it. Furthermore, in addition to any unit-specific questions or criteria, DEC's will include in the review process evaluations of the dean in the following areas, as appropriate to the individual unit:**
 - * **Quality of relationship with, and care for, students**
 - * **Quality of collegial relationship between the dean and the faculty and/or fellows**
 - * **Performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff**
 - * **Performance of financial and strategic management of the unit's resources**
 - * **Overall performance**

⁵ Who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors

- 9a. A survey should be formulated by the DEC. Provision should be made for narrative comments as well as a series of multiple-choice evaluations. The multiple-choice evaluations will include the five performance areas listed above plus any unit-specific additions from the unit faculty.

Generic templates for a faculty and a staff survey are appended as Appendix II (faculty) and III (staff). They are only meant to be of assistance to the DEC, which that can add, amend, or delete elements as appropriate for the particular unit. These surveys have been formulated based on the initial survey used by SCILS. Nevertheless, all previous survey formats should be kept by CTAAR and be made available to the DEC for consideration.

Analysis of the data will be programmed so that means and other statistics will be standard outputs, along with anonymous listing of the narrative comments. This summary of respondents' input is all that will be made available to those having access to survey results. The system must provide privacy assurances for the faculty, staff, students and other respondents. Use of an electronic survey is recommended, but for units using an online survey, non-electronic copies of the survey instrument will be provided to faculty, students or staff who do not wish to participate in the electronic version, and the DEC will need to determine how to protect the confidentiality of those respondents and how to ensure that their views are included in the overall evaluation. Response rates for the survey by type of respondent (tenured and tenure-track faculty, other faculty, student, administrative and non-administrative staff, other) should be reported along with the survey results.

Units may wish to collect additional data, such as:

- * Respondent's familiarity with dean's performance in position
- * Quality of faculty and program development
- * Fairness and ethics
- * Leadership
- * Communication
- * Functional competence
- * Commitment to diversity
- * Interpersonal skills

- 9b. The survey will be carried out by the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTAAR). Numerical results will be tabulated by CTAAR, as will the written comments. Nevertheless, evaluating the data and formulating the report is the task of the DEC.
- 9c. The committee or an external subcommittee will write a summary of the written comments and will correlate them with the numerical results (if any).
10. A thorough evaluation process should be carried out by the DEC. Additional input could include discussion summarized in narrative form (similar to departmental narratives used in faculty personnel decisions), or letters and communications from individuals commenting on the dean's performance, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved if desired by those respondents. Units are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The dean's supervisor is encouraged to make available some secretarial support to the DEC.

- 11. Once completed, the report of the DEC shall be sent to the dean, along with a request for a written response. The DEC will have access to the dean's response but will not act on it. The DEC will append the response of the dean to its report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute one copy each to the president, the EVPAA, the dean's supervisor (if other than the EVPAA) and the chair of the University Senate. It is expected that the results will be confidential and that those with access to the results will respect that confidentiality.**
- 12. The DEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty of the unit. In preparing this summary, the DEC may also wish to summarize the response of the dean. The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the DEC. It is suggested that some results of the survey be part of the feedback summary. Since this policy further dissociates the evaluation process from personnel decisions by prescribing different times for each, more detailed communication of the evaluation results to the faculty from the DEC is appropriate. The dean's supervisor should have the opportunity to suggest changes to the summary to the committee. The DEC will decide whether there should be feedback to other constituencies that have provided input to the evaluation and on the content of this feedback.**
- 13. The supervisor should meet with the dean to discuss the evaluation.**
- 14. The supervisor should then meet with the dean and the faculty to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to unit policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.**

G. RESOLUTION

In Support of FAP Committee Report and Recommendations

Whereas, the University Senate's Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee has examined and reported on the first part (Decanal Evaluation) of charge A-0812 on the evaluation of administrators by faculty and students; and

Whereas, the University Senate has reviewed the Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee's report and its recommendations for an amended policy, finding those recommendations to be sound and in the best interests of Rutgers University;

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Rutgers University Senate endorses the Report on the first part of the charge on Evaluation of Administrators by Faculty, Staff and Students, and urges the administration to implement its recommendations.

Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee members:

Gould, Ann, Cook (F), Co-Chair
Panayotatos, Paul, Engineering (F), Co-Chair
Abercrombie, Elizabeth, GS-N (F)
Boylan, Edward, FAS-N (F)
Burrell, Sherry, CCAS (F)
Carr, Deborah, SAS-NB (F)
Ciklamini, Marlene, SAS-NB (F)
Creese, Ian, GS-N (F)
Ellis, Nancy, PTL-C (F)
Fernandez, Vivian, VP for Faculty & Staff Resources (non-senator)
Finegold, David, SMLR Dean (A)
Fishbein, Leslie, SAS-NB (F)
Gursoy, Melike, Engineering (F)
Janes, Harry, SEBS (F)
Levine, Justine, NB Staff
Markert, Joseph, RBS-N/NB (F)
Mojaddedi, Jawid, SAS-NB (F)
Niederman, Robert, GS-NB (F)
Rodgers, Yana, SAS-NB (F)
Rudman, Laurie, GS-NB (F)
Sass, Louis, GSAPP (F)
Simmons, Peter, Law-N (F)
Thompson, Frank, SPAA (F)
Thompson, Karen, PTL-NB
Tomassone, Maria, Engineering (F)
Wagner, Mary, Pharmacy (F)

APPENDIX I

October 29, 2008

Draft Statement on Revised University Senate Procedures for Evaluation of Administrators

In March 2004, the University Senate adopted amended procedures for review of University administrators. To date, eight deans and administrators have been reviewed under the new process university-wide; one additional review was begun and then halted mid-course, due to the dean stepping down from the position. The purpose of this document is to comment on the general efficiency and effectiveness of the revised process, to point out those aspects of the procedure where further clarification or modification might be provided, and to make some recommendations for improving the review process going forward. Decanal Evaluation Committee (DEC) chairs, sometimes at the urging of their committees, frequently provided feedback on the process at the conclusion of the review, and this summary largely reflects their observations and comments.

Overall Assessment

In general, those who participated in the process thought it was a fair and objective one, providing sufficient input from those being evaluated as well as their constituents. Chairs felt that it provided a way for administrators to get honest feedback in a neutral, non-hostile environment, and to have the time to write a reasoned response to criticisms and a jointly developed plan for addressing them. Several participants mentioned the importance of having senior level faculty and staff from outside the unit participate in the review, making it more balanced and transparent and by broadly acknowledging issues that may have previously been known only internally within the unit. All groups, however, took significantly longer to complete the reviews than they had originally anticipated, and several chairs expressed that the process was more cumbersome than it needed to be to produce the desired results.

Requested Guideline Clarifications

One factor contributing to the delays in completion was the time the committees spent trying to fully understand and comply with the intent of the process. In several instances revised language to clarify the Senate's intent would be welcome:

- In amendment D7, some committee members interpreted the language as requiring that meaningful faculty, student, and staff input be received *in developing the review plan*, while others interpreted it as requiring that meaningful faculty, student, and staff input be received *in the evaluation itself*. This requirement should be clarified going forward.
- Amendment D9 of the Senate policy indicates that the DEC should present its plan to the appropriate constituency body of the unit for approval. In several units, it was not completely clear which people/group constituted the "appropriate constituency body" for this purpose. In particular, there was difficulty determining whether the entire faculty needed to approve the plan or whether the approval of some subgroup of faculty (e.g. department chairs, an executive committee) would be sufficient. At a minimum, the relevant constituency group should be decided upon in advance by the dean and the dean's supervisor and provided to the DEC up front.
- Amendment D11 calls for the DEC to solicit a written response to their evaluation from the dean, but does not make explicit whether the DEC members should have access to the response, whether they are permitted to change their evaluation report based on it (for example to correct factual errors pointed out

by the dean or to make the language of the report clearer in cases where the dean has misunderstood their findings), or whether they should consider it in drafting the public summary of the evaluation report.

- Amendment D12 is explicit in specifying preparation of a non-confidential summary and how it should be shared with the faculty. It says nothing, however, about what others providing input to the evaluation (staff, students, alumni) should be told about the outcome.

Larger Process Changes Recommended for Consideration

- Almost all groups chose to solicit a statement from the Dean, detailing responsibilities and accomplishments. This should be incorporated into the process as a required step, standardizing its length, the information it should include, etc. This statement should be available to the committee before they finalize the review plan and survey instrument. The process should further specify that this Dean's statement should then be shared with those asked to evaluate the Dean as part of the process. Providing DEC's with the Dean's formal job description was also suggested.
- A huge amount of DEC time is spent on developing the review plan and survey instrument before data gathering begins. Several chairs recommended that the survey, either online or paper, become a required part of the process. They also called for a standardized instrument to be developed, which could then be customized by DEC's to capture the distinctiveness of a unit (adding, deleting, rewording a small set of questions, instead of developing the full survey). All surveys should include space for written comments. The recommendation was that a Senate committee would review the survey instruments used to date and propose a standardized template for the survey instrument, to be shared for comment with deans and deans' supervisors before finalizing. Having a standardized instrument would also help make the reviews more comparable.
- Several committees expressed frustration with the requirement that the unit faculty as whole need to approve the review plan as well as the use of a survey in advance of the process actually getting underway. Here too, it was felt that developing a "customized" review plan did not add significant value and that a more streamlined, uniform approach was desirable. Further, most faculty in the unit have not read the guidelines, do not know what they are supposed to do, and believe they have more detailed involvement than is actually called for. Many schools do not meet as a whole to provide a "unit" response to the process (again, the guidelines are unclear on this), so that it is difficult for the committee to determine how to respond to individual faculty comments. If a survey instrument is agreed upon as the standard data-gathering tool, this back and forth could be eliminated.
- Each evaluation committee should have as a permanent member a faculty or staff member with experience conducting surveys and analyzing results, with an emphasis on ensuring that the data gathered is statistically meaningful. The process calls for staff from the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research to assist with survey development and administration, but DEC's have expanded this role to include, in some cases, total responsibility for data analysis and generation of the report on survey findings.
- Related to the above point, the current process allows the committee to gather input from any constituency that it deems necessary; while this is appropriate, responses from small groups (a few alumni; a small sample of students; leadership committee, some professional groups, etc.) may not constitute a relevant sample. Response rates for all of these surveys typically have been about one-third or less. Committee members may need advice on this aspect of the process, as it is important that the committee focus on statistically relevant data, especially in units where there is some level of discord. Those who write comments are generally those who have "issues." Written comments can illustrate various perspectives, but

they can also skew a narrative unless the chair uses the data to show majority opinion. Hostile opinions from a small minority are often given more weight than is warranted. It is important to know whether a representative sample of responses from the various constituencies has been captured.

- There was one recommendation to consider eliminating or dissuading committees from any data gathering beyond the survey instrument (group meetings, interviews, or phone interviews) because it is problematic, time consuming, and frequently not statistically relevant. In addition to administering a survey, for example, one DEC decided to conduct open meetings for student groups believing that it might be a good way for students as a group to provide feedback. They scheduled about six meetings that required a recorder and meeting conductor—all from committee member volunteers. There were only a small number of students at each meeting and the work involved in orchestrating this did not add sufficiently to the survey instrument data. The comments were used to illustrate the numerical data, but the DEC could not use the findings on their own as statistically significant. A similar situation occurs with interviewing staff and alumni leadership. While these interviews are often interesting, they are very time consuming and not statistically valid on their own. They can only be used for the collection of factual information or in conjunction with the survey instrument data to illustrate perspectives, but overall seem to add little to the evaluation.
- A special caution seems in order when evaluative comments are sought from individuals or groups external to the university. These people cannot, and generally will not, comment on how someone operates in their campus position, and they often do not know how to respond when asked about the dean's performance within another organization. Even when the purpose of the evaluation is explained, external people have difficulty knowing how to respond. Some rethinking of what can be gained from including those with outside affiliations in these reviews is needed.
- A suggestion was made that the original charge to the DEC include a "planning time line" with activities and suggested deadlines to minimize the last minute frenzy that happens all too often. Each committee spends significant time up front inventing this process for themselves. Then, as time grows short, they contact Monica Devanas for help with the survey, with insufficient time to consider the issues, the survey questions and format, how to distribute the survey, to whom, deadlines, efforts to make the process known, or advocate for better participation. Often, these decisions are then left to Monica rather the DEC.
- Over time, the DECs have become increasingly disengaged in their tasks. In many (though not all) of the committees much of the work of the committee is ultimately carried out by the chair. When the chair is unwilling or unable to devote the necessary time to this task, much of the responsibility gets relegated the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research staff and staff within the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. These staff members end up structuring and arranging the meetings, drafting and mailing out letters to the various stakeholder groups, analyzing the survey data, generating reports, refining datasets, etc. This seems counter to the Senate intent of these procedures, namely, to have the administrators evaluated by a group of their peers and constituents.