



University Senate
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC)

**Response to Charge A-0812: Evaluation of Administrators
Part II: Evaluation of Upper Administrators**

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. (Reissued in February 2011, for March 2012 reporting.)

B. Procedure

The FPAC originally opted to separate the part of the charge that addressed the evaluation of deans from the issue of extending the process to include vice presidents and other administrators, including the president. The former part was deemed urgent and was addressed in March 2010 by the development of the current policy for evaluation of deans, voted by the senate (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/reports.html>) and adopted with slight modifications by the administration (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/RLMAckA0812PartIEvaluationOfDeansReceivedJuly2010.html>).

The latter part of the charge, namely examining the feasibility of extending the process to include vice presidents and other administrators, 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. This is the object of the current report.

C. Summary

As elaborated upon below, the FPAC makes the following recommendations:

- To limit the evaluations of upper administrators to the President, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), and the Chancellors.
- To formulate the evaluation of the EVPAA and of the Chancellors so that it forms input to the President.
- To formulate the evaluation of the President so that it forms input to a comprehensive periodic evaluation of the President by the Board of Governors.

The FPAC members believe that this is a very opportune time for instituting such policies since, given the transitional stage in all but one of the above administrative positions, the process of instituting evaluation policies can not generate any misconceptions of being targeted at specific individuals.

D. History: the current decanal policy to be extended to upper administrators

The procedure for the evaluation of administrators by faculty, staff, and students was first proposed by the New Brunswick Faculty Council in March of 2000, which recommended that its Personnel Policy Committee, 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 Senate (then-) 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).
- Reviews were to occur no less frequently than every five years with no process provided to trigger a review.
- Stated purpose was “.... to provide input to the supervising administrator of the reviewee as to his/her performance.”

Following the Lawrence administration, the new administration of President McCormick and Executive Vice President Furmanski assured the FAPC that they welcomed such a process to evaluate administrators provided it was tailored to make the results more reliable and the evaluation more comprehensive¹. The FAPC met with the President, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), and the provosts, and used their input to formulate a new policy that was adopted by the senate in March of 2004. This 2004 policy had the following features:

- A more thorough evaluation process (beyond a survey) was to be carried out by an *ad hoc* evaluation committee formed by the president or the dean's supervisor with input from the appropriate constituency bodies.
- Once charged by the dean's supervisor, the evaluation committee was to devise a plan for the evaluation with input from the appropriate constituency bodies. The plan and its details were to be approved by these bodies before the evaluation commenced.
- An all-inclusive survey was not mandated in the 2004 policy, although it was the one part of the 2001 policy that had met with wide satisfaction. The decision to include a survey, as well as other aspects of the evaluation format, was left to the discretion of the ad hoc

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

committee and the individual unit.

- The process mandated that the evaluation committee provide some feedback to the appropriate constituencies on the results of the evaluation.
- The process also mandated that there be some feedback from the administration to the faculty on policy changes stemming from the process.
- The stated goal of the evaluation was to improve the performance of the individual being reviewed. Still, it was expected that the evaluation would 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 conducted because of the deans scheduled for review resigned.

The EVPAA asked his staff for a review of the evaluation process. As a result of the experience from these six evaluations, the current policy of 2009 was formulated and adopted for 2010. It is as follows:

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 members², 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

² Full-time or part-time faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors

members² 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 members² 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 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.
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
- 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,

³ Full-time or part-time faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors

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.

The policy was adopted by the administration with the following two modifications⁴:

«We also are pleased to accept two additional recommendations of the Senate, with slight modification. The first of these calls for the dean being evaluated to submit a brief statement of responsibilities and accomplishments, as well as the dean's vision and strategic plan for the unit. On the New Brunswick campus this document should be requested by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, as the revised document suggests. However, on the Newark and Camden campuses, the dean should receive the request for this document from the Chancellors. The second recommendation to be accepted in slightly revised form relates to the dean's response to the draft evaluation report.

The document now specifies that the evaluation committee should have access to the dean's response but will not act on it. This language should be amended to allow modification to the original evaluation report in response to the dean's reply, particularly in cases where the dean has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation.

With these slight modifications, the revised process should serve the university well as we proceed to conduct decanal reviews on all three campuses.»

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.

⁴ <http://senate.rutgers.edu/RLMAckA0812PartIEvaluationOfDeansReceivedJuly2010.html>

E. Discussion and Recommendations

The FPAC discussed the charge in five meetings: October, November, and December 2011 as well as January and February 2012, with the December expanded meeting dedicated to this charge.

Documents used include the 2001 policy (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/adminrev.html>), the 2004 policy (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/fapadminevalreview.html>) and the 2009 report (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/reports.html>) including the Draft Statement on Revised University Senate Procedures for Evaluation of Administrators produced by the office of the EVPAA, included in the latter report as Appendix I. Policies from peer institutions were sought out on the web and were also discussed. For the discussions on the evaluation of the President, the web site and publications of the Association of Governing Boards (<http://agb.org/>) were also used, in particular the publication “Assessing Presidential Effectiveness” by Richard L. Morrill.

The first decision was to define the “Upper Administrators” to be covered by this policy. The committee considered a number of administrators including New Brunswick SAS Area Deans, the President, and several Vice President, Chancellor, and Vice Chancellor positions. The committee concluded the following:

- With respect to the SAS Area Deans: although promotion recommendations do fall under the purview of several area deans, both the final recommendation and budgetary allocations rest with the dean of SAS who should continue to be the sole person being evaluated in SAS, as in other units.
- With respect to some 120 Vice Presidents other than the EVPAA and Vice Chancellors: reporting arrangements are so complex, with direct and dotted line reporting, that they form an intricate web that cannot be tackled by a single policy. The committee decided to limit its recommendations to the evaluation of administrators that have academic responsibilities such as budgets, teaching assignments, chair assignments, promotion recommendations, etc. Thus the policies proposed are limited to upper administrators, namely, to the President, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), and the Chancellors.

The decanal policies can be readily extended to the EVPAA and the Chancellors since their “supervisor” can be readily identified as the President of the University. The same is not true for the evaluation of the President. The committee formulated the policy for the evaluation of the President as input to the Board of Governors (BoG). Initial consultation of the chair of the University Senate with the chair of the BoG indicated that the BoG could be amenable to such an arrangement.

Thus there are three proposed variations of the extension of the decanal evaluation process:

- I. A campus-wide evaluation process for the Chancellors as input to the President’s evaluation of the Chancellors
- II. A University-wide policy for the EVPAA as input to the President’s evaluation of the EVPAA
- III. A University-wide policy for the President as input to the BoG’s evaluation of the President

E.I. Proposed evaluation process for Chancellors

The committee is cognizant of the fact that these exercises require significant expenditure of people-hours. The committee believes that an evaluation cycle of five years is not too short for initiating suggested changes and not too long for affording the opportunity to assess the success of such changes. In addition, anticipated evaluation in a reasonably short horizon might allow faculty to wait in order to express their possible discontent; absence of such anticipation would almost certainly lead to a vote of no confidence as the only alternative.

For the two Chancellors the decanal evaluations are then easily expanded: the “supervisor” becomes the President and the “Unit” is the whole campus. Thus the proposed policy for evaluation of Chancellors becomes as follows:

Recommendation 1: The Senate recommends the following process for the periodic evaluation of Chancellors:

1. Each Chancellor shall normally be evaluated by faculty, staff and students in the campus every five years, but an additional, out-of-cycle evaluation can be triggered at any time by the President, by the Chancellor, or by the campus faculty or students. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the campus tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students of the campus, to the chair of the Faculty Council of the campus, or equivalent person, triggers a secret ballot by the faculty, run by the Faculty Council or similar shared governance faculty body, where the question of whether to have an out-of-cycle evaluation of the Chancellor, to commence at the current semester, is decided by majority vote of those voting. An evaluation by petition can only be requested once between any two consecutive evaluations.
2. The initial evaluation for newly appointed Chancellors 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 President. Such evaluations should be carried out in year 4, if this would allow enough time for the Chancellors to act on suggestions resulting from the evaluation. A single semester should normally suffice for completion of the evaluation.
3. The President will meet with all of the campus faculty and the Chancellor to initiate the process. Generally, the Faculty Council will also be the “appropriate constituency body.” If Rutgers-Camden faculty do not form a Faculty Council, an appropriately representative body shall be identified by the President to the campus faculty at the onset of the evaluation process.
4. The University Senate will be informed by the President in case of major delays or irregularities.
5. An ad hoc Chancellor Evaluation Committee (CEC), the majority of which must be faculty members⁵, will be formed by the President, as follows:
 - 5a. The appropriate governance body of the campus will submit a slate of fifteen faculty members⁵ from within the campus, from which five will be chosen. In

⁵ Full-time or part-time faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors

submitting the slate, care should be taken so that all the units of the campus are represented, ideally proportionally. In choosing the committee members the President should also take such representation into account.

- 5b. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit a slate of three faculty members⁵, two from New Brunswick and one from the other of the two campuses, from which one will be chosen.
- 5c. Up to two administrators can be appointed by the President.
6. The CEC will meet as a body to elect its chair.
7. The Chancellor will be asked by the President 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 campus. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the CEC. The Chancellor's statement should be made available to those providing input to the process.
8. The CEC, in consultation with the President, 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 Chancellor may have substantial contact. In so doing, the CEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty⁵. The CEC 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 CEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the Chancellor and the President. 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, CECs will include in the review process evaluations of the Chancellor in the following areas, as appropriate to the individual campus:
 - Quality of relationship with, and care for, students
 - Quality of collegial relationship between the Chancellor and the faculty
 - Performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff
 - Performance of strategic and financial management of the unit's resources, including cost sharing on proposals for external grants
 - Fundraising
 - Overall performance
- 9a. Several surveys should be formulated by the CEC. 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 specific additions from the campus faculty.

Generic templates for a faculty and a staff survey are available for decanal evaluations and can be amended as necessary. They are only meant to be of assistance to the CEC, which that can add, amend, or delete elements as appropriate for the particular case. These surveys have been formulated based on the initial survey used for decanal evaluations by SCILS. Nevertheless, all previous survey formats should be kept by CTAAR and be made available to

the CEC for consideration.

The CEC should direct different surveys to several groups: faculty in general, administrative and non-administrative staff, department chairs, deans, fund raising professionals, etc.

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 CEC 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 Chancellor'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(s) 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 CEC and should not be delegated to the staff of CTAAR.

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 CEC. 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 Chancellor's performance, and results of interviews, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved if desired by those respondents. CECs are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The President is encouraged to make available some secretarial support to the CEC.

11. Once completed, the report of the CEC shall be sent to the Chancellor, along with a request for a written response. The CEC will have access to the Chancellor's response and will consider modification to the original evaluation report in response to the Chancellor's reply, particularly in cases where the Chancellor has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation. The CEC will append the response of the

Chancellor to its report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute one copy each to the President, the Chancellor, 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 CEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty of the campus. In preparing this summary, the CEC may also wish to summarize the response of the Chancellor. The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the CEC. 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 CEC is appropriate. The President should have the opportunity to suggest changes to the summary to the committee. The CEC will decide if there should be feedback to other constituencies that have provided input to the evaluation and on the content of this feedback.
13. The President should meet with the Chancellor to discuss the evaluation.
14. The President should then meet with the Chancellor and all the faculty of the campus to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to campus policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

E.II. Proposed evaluation process for the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA)

For the EVPAA the decanal evaluations are also easily expanded: the “supervisor” becomes the President and the “Unit” is the whole University. However, the EVPAA also serves effectively as the Chancellor for New Brunswick and a weighted response should be sought both on virtue of this extra role, as well as from the relative size of the NB campus. Thus the proposed policy for evaluation of the EVPAA becomes as follows:

Recommendation 2: The Senate recommends the following process for the periodic evaluation of the EVPAA:

1. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA) shall normally be evaluated by faculty, staff, and students in the University every five years, but an additional, out-of-cycle evaluation can be triggered at any time by the President, by the EVPAA, or by the faculty or the students. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the University’s tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students, to the chair of the University Senate, triggers a secret ballot by the faculty, run by the University Senate, where the question of whether to have an out-of-cycle evaluation of the EVPAA, to commence at the current semester, is decided by majority vote of those voting. An evaluation by petition can only be requested once between any two consecutive evaluations.
2. The initial evaluation for newly appointed EVPAA’s 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 President. Such evaluations should be carried out in year 4, if

- this would allow enough time for the EVPAAAs to act on suggestions resulting from the evaluation. A single semester should normally suffice for completion of the evaluation.
3. The President will meet with all of the campus Faculty Councils, and similar faculty governance body from Rutgers-Camden if a Faculty Council is not established, in a joint session and with the EVPAA to initiate the process. Generally, this joint body of Faculty Councils will also be the “appropriate constituency body.” If Rutgers-Camden faculty do not form a Faculty Council, an appropriately representative body shall be identified by the President to the campus faculty at the onset of the evaluation process.
 4. The University Senate will be informed by the President in case of major delays or irregularities.
 5. An ad hoc EVPAA Evaluation Committee (EVPEC), the majority of which must be faculty members⁶, will be formed by the President, as follows:
 - 5a. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit three slates of faculty members⁶, as follows: twelve from New Brunswick, six from Newark and three from Camden. The president will choose four members from the New Brunswick slate, two from the Newark slate, and one from the Camden slate. In submitting the slates, care should be taken so that the larger units are represented. In choosing the committee members the President should also take such representation into account.
 - 5b. Up to two administrators can be appointed by the President.
 6. The EVPEC will meet as a body to elect its chair.
 7. The EVPAA will be asked by the President 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 University. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the EVPEC. The EVPAA’s statement should be made available to those providing input to the process.
 8. The EVPEC, in consultation with the President, will decide whether to include in its membership representatives from among the staff, students, alumni, or other constituencies (from within or without the university) with whom the EVPAA may have substantial contact. In so doing, the EVPEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty⁶. The EVPEC 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, and/or officers of the appropriate student governing association.
 9. The EVPEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the EVPAA and the President. 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 specific questions or criteria, EVPECs will include in the review process evaluations of the EVPAA in the following areas, as appropriate to the individual campus:

⁶ Full-time or part-time faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors.

- Quality of relationship with, and care for, students
- Quality of collegial relationship between the EVPAA and the faculty
- Performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff
- Performance of strategic and financial management of the unit's resources, including cost sharing on proposals for external grants,
- Fundraising
- Overall performance

9a. Several surveys should be formulated by the EVPEC. 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 specific additions from the campus faculty.

Generic templates for a faculty and a staff survey are available for decanal evaluations and can be amended as necessary. They are only meant to be of assistance to the EVPEC, which that can add, amend, or delete elements as appropriate for the particular case. These surveys have been formulated based on the initial survey used for decanal evaluations by SCILS. Nevertheless, all previous survey formats should be kept by CTAAR and be made available to the EVPEC for consideration.

The EVPEC should direct different surveys to several groups: faculty in general, administrative and non-administrative staff, department chairs, deans, fund raising professionals, etc.

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 EVPEC 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 EVPAA'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(s) 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 EVPEC and should not be delegated to the staff of CTAAR.

- 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 EVPEC. 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 EVPAA's performance, and results of interviews, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved if desired by those respondents. EVPECs are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The President is encouraged to make available some secretarial support to the EVPEC.
11. Once completed, the report of the EVPEC shall be sent to the EVPAA, along with a request for a written response. The EVPEC will have access to the EVPAA's response and will consider modification to the original evaluation report in response to the EVPAA's reply, particularly in cases where the EVPAA has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation. The EVPEC will append the response of the EVPAA to its report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute one copy each to the President, 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 EVPEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty. In preparing this summary, the EVPEC may also wish to summarize the response of the EVPAA. The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the EVPEC. 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 EVPEC is appropriate. The President should have the opportunity to suggest changes to the summary to the committee. The EVPEC will decide if there should be feedback to other constituencies that have provided input to the evaluation and on the content of this feedback.
13. The President should meet with the EVPAA to discuss the evaluation.
14. The President should then meet with the EVPAA and the joint body of Faculty Councils to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to University policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.
15. The President should also meet with the EVPAA and the New Brunswick Faculty Council to discuss those results of the evaluation that specifically pertain to New Brunswick campus policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

E.III. Proposed evaluation process for the University President

Assessment and evaluation are the catch words of the 21st century and the number of public colleges and universities doing annual reviews of their presidents jumped from 66 percent to 92 percent over the last decade, according to a 2008 survey by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (ABG).

Nearly 53 percent of public colleges say they are also doing more in-depth, comprehensive assessments of their presidents every three to five years, according to the survey.

Several of our peer institutions have policies of periodic evaluations of their presidents but the method and availability of the resultant report varies widely from a completely confidential regents-only evaluation (Maryland⁷) to a 360° university community evaluation with the results appearing on the web (University of Michigan-Ann Arbor⁸). Outside consultants may be utilized and surveys may be one of the instruments of evaluation, albeit not the only one, in the policies of several institutions⁹.

The FPAC decided not to recommend a policy of evaluation as radical as the one in Ann-Arbor, even if that is an institution to which Rutgers aspires. The culture at Rutgers, built from the decadal evaluations, is for the report to remain confidential and for a summary to be disseminated. We also agree with the AGB that such evaluations should be carried out by the Governing Board. The role of shared governance in these evaluations would then be to provide input to a comprehensive periodic evaluation to the Rutgers Board of Governors (BoG). The FPAC and the University senate urge the BoG to institute such a periodic comprehensive evaluation but do not presume that it will do so. Nevertheless, the FPAC contends that even if such an evaluation is not instituted, the process of soliciting the “campus climate” about the University President would not be without merit. The period for such an evaluation would reasonably be four years, which is a usual turn-around time for many University presidents. Thus the FPAC puts forth, subject to approval by the full senate, the following recommendation:

Recommendation 3: The University Senate urges the Rutgers Board of Governors to institute a periodic comprehensive evaluation of the President of the University, conducted every four years, to which an evaluation of the President by faculty, staff, and students will provide input.

The evaluation of the president should be similar to the one for the EVPAA in that it also involves all campuses. However the “supervisor” is the BoG, which is not involved in this part of the process. That role needs to be performed by the Executive Committee of the University Senate. Thus the proposed policy for evaluation of the President becomes as follows:

⁷ The Chancellor of the University System of Maryland appoints a review committee to evaluate the Presidents of the Universities in the system.The committee then submits its report to the Chancellor. The report remains confidential and becomes part of the president's personnel file.

⁸ The University of Michigan-Ann Arbor Faculty Senate conducted a precedent-setting campus-wide evaluation of academic administrators during December 2004, which has now been carried out on an annual basis. The results are made available online, including the evaluation of the President. In 2004 a specially created standing committee constructed an on-line evaluation system, which consisted of electronic questionnaires and specially tailored software and information systems. Once this had been carried out, it was used for subsequent years without need for a newly created system.

⁹ At the University of Washington the board of regents performs confidential annual evaluation of the President with the help of an outside consultant who conducts a survey, oversees the process, and prepares the report.

Recommendation 4: The Senate recommends the following process for the periodic evaluation of the University President:

1. The University President shall normally be evaluated by faculty, staff, and students in the University every four years, but an additional, out-of-cycle evaluation can be triggered at any time by the Senate Executive Committee (EC), by the President, or by the faculty or the students. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the University's tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students, to the chair of the University Senate, triggers a secret ballot by the faculty, run by the University Senate, where the question of whether to have an out-of-cycle evaluation of the President, to commence at the current semester, is decided by majority vote of those voting. An evaluation by petition can only be requested once between any two consecutive evaluations.
2. A single semester should normally suffice for completion of the evaluation.
3. The President will meet with all of the campus Faculty Councils, and similar faculty governance body from Rutgers-Camden if a Faculty Council is not established, in a joint session augmented by the Senate EC to initiate the process. Generally, this joint body of Faculty Councils will also be the "appropriate constituency body." If Rutgers-Camden faculty do not form a Faculty Council, an appropriately representative body shall be identified by the Senate EC to the campus faculty at the onset of the evaluation process.
4. The University Senate will be informed by the President in case of major delays or irregularities.
5. An ad hoc President Evaluation Committee (PEC), the majority of which must be faculty members¹⁰, will be formed by the Senate EC, as follows:
 - 5a. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit three slates of faculty members¹⁰, as follows: twelve from New Brunswick, six from Newark, and three from Camden. The president will choose four members from the New Brunswick slate, two from the Newark slate, and one from the Camden slate. In submitting the slates, care should be taken so that the larger units are represented. From the remaining faculty on the slate that were not selected, two shall be selected at random by the University Senate Executive Committee, and placed on the committee. In choosing the committee members the President should also take such representation into account.
 - 5b. Up to two administrators can be appointed by the Senate EC in consultation with the President.
6. The PEC will meet as a body to elect its chair.
7. The President will be asked by the Senate EC to submit to the committee, within a reasonable time frame, a statement detailing responsibilities and accomplishments that will include data as well as his/her vision and strategic plan for the University. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the PEC. The President's statement should be made available to those providing input to the process.

¹⁰ Full-time or part-time faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors.

8. The PEC, in consultation with the Senate EC, will decide on whether or not to include in its membership representatives from among the staff, students, alumni, or other constituencies (from within or without the university) with whom the President may have substantial contact. In so doing, the PEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty¹⁰. The PEC 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, and/or officers of the appropriate student governing association.
9. The PEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the President and the Senate EC. 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 specific questions or criteria, PECs will include in the review process evaluations of the President in the following areas, as appropriate to the individual survey:
 - Quality of relationship with, and care for, students
 - Quality of collegial relationship between the President and the faculty
 - Performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff
 - Performance of strategic and financial management of the unit's resources, including cost sharing on proposals for external grants,
 - Fundraising
 - Performance representing the University to elected officials and to the people of the state of New Jersey
 - Overall performance
- 9a. Several surveys should be formulated by the PEC. 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 specific additions from the campus faculty.

Generic templates for a faculty and a staff survey are available for decanal evaluations and can be amended as necessary. They are only meant to be of assistance to the PEC, which that can add, amend, or delete elements as appropriate for the particular case. These surveys have been formulated based on the initial survey used for decanal evaluations by SCILS. Nevertheless, all previous survey formats should be kept by CTAAR and be made available to the PEC for consideration.

The PEC should direct different surveys to several groups: faculty in general, administrative and non-administrative staff, department chairs, deans, fund raising professionals, etc.

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 PEC 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 President'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(s) 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 PEC and should not be delegated to the staff of CTAAR.

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 PEC. 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 President's performance, and results of interviews, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved if desired by those respondents. PECs are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The President is encouraged to make available some secretarial support to the PEC.
11. Once completed, the report of the PEC shall be sent to the President, along with a request for a written response. The PEC will have access to the President's response and will consider modification to the original evaluation report in response to the President's reply, particularly in cases where the President has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation. The PEC will append the response of the President to its report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute one copy each to the Chair of the Board of Governors, the President, 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 PEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty. In preparing this summary, the PEC may also wish to summarize the response of the President. The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the PEC. 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

PEC is appropriate. The President should have the opportunity to suggest changes to the summary to the committee. The PEC 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 President should meet with the joint body of Faculty Councils to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to University policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

F. RESOLUTION

In Support of Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee Report and Recommendations:

Whereas, the University Senate's Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee has examined and reported on the second part (Evaluation of Upper Administrators) 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 the establishment of three distinct policies for the evaluation of Chancellors, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President as well as the recommendation to the Board of Governors to institute a comprehensive periodic evaluation of the University President, and 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 second part of the charge on Evaluation of Administrators by Faculty, Staff and Students, pertaining to the President, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chancellors, and urges the administration to implement its recommendations. It further instructs the chair of the University Senate to communicate to the Board of Governors the recommendations pertaining to the evaluation of the President.

Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee members:

Gould, Ann, SEBS (F), Co-Chair - *Executive Committee Liaison*

Panayotatos, Paul, GS-NB (F), Co-Chair - *Executive Committee Liaison*

Alizadeh, Farid, RBS:UNB (F)

Bagchi, Prosenjit, Engineering (F)

Boylan, Edward, FAS-N (F)

Creese, Ian, Other Units-N (F)

Fernandez, Vivian, Vice President for Faculty and Staff Resources (*Non-Senator*)

Goldstein, Daniel, GS-NB (F)

Gurfinkiel, Israel, FAS-C (F)

Harris, John, SAS-NB (F)

Hetling, Andrea, EJBSPPP (F)

Hock, Karlo, PTL-NB (F)

Isenburg, Steven, PTL-C (F)

Janes, Harry, SEBS (F)

Leibman, Ray, PTL-N (F)

Midlarsky, Manus, SAS-NB (F)

Mojaddedi, Jawid, SAS-NB (F)

Niederman, Robert, SAS-NB (F)

Robinson, Joanne, SON-Camden Acting Dean (A)

Schurman, Susan, SMLR Acting Dean (A) - *Administrative Liaison*

Simmons, Peter, Law-N (F)

Suplee, Patricia, FAS-C (F)

Thompson, Karen, PTL-NB (F)

Toney-Boss, Permelia, Newark Staff

Wagner, Mary, Pharmacy (F)