



University Senate
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC)

**Response to Charge A-1603: Evaluation of Administrators
Part II: Evaluation of Chancellors**

A. Charge

A-1603 Evaluation of Administrators, Part II: Evaluation of Chancellors: Given the joint Rutgers-UMDNJ integration and changes in administrative structure, reconsider the process recommended by the University Senate in 2012 for evaluation of upper administrators, now with a focus on evaluating chancellors. Respond to the Senate Executive Committee by April 2016. [Issued November 2012. Reissued June 2015. Revised to focus on evaluation of chancellors, and reissued as A-1603 March 2016.]

B. Background

In March, 2012, the University Senate endorsed a periodic review process for chancellors (<http://senate.rutgers.edu/FPAConA0812Part2EvaluationOfUpperAdministratorsMarch2012.pdf>), prepared by the Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC), as part of a more comprehensive proposal that included review procedures for the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the University President¹. By way of response to that report, then Interim-President Richard Edwards replied:

As you know, the university is in a stage of considerable transition. Dr. Robert L. Barchi will assume the Rutgers presidency effective September 1, 2012. In addition, the New Jersey Medical and Health Sciences Education Restructuring Act, which awaits approval by Gov. Christie and our governing boards, would significantly restructure the university and includes provisions to create several new high-level administrative positions. Given the unknown implications of both of these changes on the university's administrative structure, I do not support the adoption of a new and significant evaluation procedure for upper administrators at this time.

Since then, the office of Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs has been dissolved (June 2015), and upper administrative offices and reporting relationships resulting from the New Jersey Medical and Health Sciences Education Restructuring Act have been firmly set. Rutgers is now comprised of four independent units or complex entities led by a chief executive called a chancellor, each of whom reports to the University president. The FPAC considers the timing optimal to ask the

¹ The FPAC was given permission by the Executive Committee to further narrow the charge to pertain only to the University President; this report, endorsed by the Senate in February 2013, was not accepted by the Board of Governors.

Senate to endorse a resolution requesting the administration to implement the chancellor review process previously approved by the Senate, with slight modification.

C. The chancellor evaluation process

C.1. The policy for evaluation of chancellors (Rutgers-Camden, Rutgers-Newark, Rutgers-New Brunswick, and Rutgers-Biomedical and Health Sciences) previously endorsed by the Senate, with modification to reflect changes to University structure post integration (strike through or underline), is as follows:

From: Response to Charge A-0812: Evaluation of Administrators, Part II: Evaluation of Upper Administrators, page 8, found at the following link:
<http://senate.rutgers.edu/FPAConA0812Part2EvaluationOfUpperAdministratorsMarch2012.pdf>

1. Each Chancellor shall normally be evaluated by their 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 ~~campusunit~~ faculty or students. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the ~~campusunit's~~ tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students of the ~~campusunit~~, to the chair of the unit's Faculty Council ~~of the campus, or equivalent person,~~ triggers a secret ballot by the unit faculty, run by the Faculty Council ~~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 do not coincide with the 5-year 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 ~~campusunit~~ 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 members², will be formed by the President, as follows:
 - 5a. ~~The appropriate governance body of the campusunit Faculty Council~~ will submit a slate of fifteen faculty members from within the ~~campusunit~~, from which five will be chosen. In submitting the slate, care should be taken so that all of the units/divisions of the ~~campusunit~~ are represented, ideally proportionally. In choosing the committee members the President should

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

also take such representation into account.

- 5b. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit a slate of ~~four~~^{three} faculty members², ~~one~~^{two} each from Rutgers-Camden, Rutgers-New Brunswick, Rutgers-Newark, and Rutgers-RBHS, ~~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 unit. 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 faculty². 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 unit:
 - 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 unit's 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 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 Rutgers University-School of Communication and Information (formerly 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 campusunit. 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 campusunit to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to campusunit policy, its strategic direction, and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

C.2. For clarity, the above process with changes accepted is as follows:

1. Each Chancellor shall normally be evaluated by their faculty, staff, and students 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 unit faculty or students. 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 chair of the unit's Faculty Council triggers a secret ballot by the unit faculty, run by the Faculty Council 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 do not coincide with the 5-year 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 unit faculty and the Chancellor to initiate the 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 members³, will be formed by the President, as follows:
 - 5a. The unit Faculty Council will submit a slate of fifteen faculty members from within the unit, from which five will be chosen. In submitting the slate, care should be taken so that all of the divisions of the unit are represented, ideally proportionally. In choosing the committee members the President

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

should also take such representation into account.

- 5b. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit a slate of four faculty members³, one each from Rutgers-Camden, Rutgers-New Brunswick, Rutgers-Newark, and Rutgers-RBHS, 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 unit. 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 faculty³. 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 unit:
 - 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 unit's 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 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 Rutgers University-School of Communication and Information (formerly 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 unit. 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 unit 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.

E. Resolution

Whereas, the Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC) has examined the FPAC report on Charge A-0812 endorsed by the Senate in March, 2012; and

Whereas, the FPAC recognizes that the proposed process for periodic review of the office of Chancellor is timely and sound; and

Whereas, the FPAC has updated the original report to reflect changes in University structure post integration in Section C.2. of this report;

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the University Senate urges the administration to implement the aforementioned periodic review process for the Office of Chancellor.

Committee members

Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee 2015-2016

Gould, Ann, SEBS (F) Co-Chair- EC Liaison

Markert, Joseph, RBS:N/NB (F), Co-Chair

Ahluwalia, Jasjit, SPH Dean

Alizadeh, Farid, RBS:N/NB (F)

Anthony, Dolores, RBHS Staff

Ardeshna, Anil, RSDM (F)

Boruchoff, Susan, RWJMS (F)

Bugel, Mary Jo, RBHS At-Large (F)

Durham, Jacqueline, RBHS Staff

Eisenstein, Robert, RWJMS (F)

Fernandez, Vivian, VP Faculty/Staff Resources (non-Senator)

Grave, Floyd, MGSA (F)

Gursoy, Kemal, RBS:N/NB (F)

Lewis, Jane, SPH (F)

Morrell, Joan, Other Units N (F)

Nissen, Alison, Law-C (F)

Pandey, Virendra, NJMS (F)

Patel, Nell, RWJMS (F)

Pitt, Mackenzie, SEBS (S)

Ponzio, Nicholas, NJMS (F)

Potter, Jonathan, SCI Dean (A)

Robinson, Joanne, Nursing-C Dean (A)

Saltzman, Cynthia, PTL-C (F)

Schulberg, Justin, SAS-NB (S) – EC Liaison

Thompson, Karen, PTL-NB (F) - EC

Kalan, Marc, At Large-N (F)
Kressel, Kenneth, GS-N (F)
Langer, Jerome, RWJMS (F)
LaPointe, Eleanor, SAS-NB (F)

Liaison
Toney-Boss, Permelia, Newark Staff
Wagner, Mary, Pharmacy (F)