

8-27-08
proposed
revisions

Five-Year Review of Academic Administrative Officers

(Approved by Faculty Governance Committee, 4-23-08)

1. Guiding Principles

These procedures for the five-year review of academic administrative officers apply to all direct reports to the chancellor, academic deans (including the graduate dean and deans of libraries), department chairs, and selected other leaders. Some direct reports to the Chancellor who serve primarily in staff roles including the chief of staff, the director of communications, the university attorney, and others will be evaluated according to procedures established by the Chancellor.

The purpose of the five-year review is formative. Specifically, the goals are to improve the performance of the leader and to identify areas of leadership development. The expected outcome is improved leadership for the enhancement of the institution, and the review may lead the appointing officer to initiate a more comprehensive summative review.

Lab Use 8/27/08 11:56 AM

Deleted: necessary

Lab Use 8/27/08 11:57 AM

Deleted:

Lab Use 8/27/08 12:23 PM

Deleted: result in actions ranging from commendation to termination.

The five-year review is the responsibility of the appointing officer (hereafter to be named the reviewing officer), who shall determine its conduct, processes, conclusions and necessary actions resulting from the review. The review should be a collaborative endeavor involving students, faculty, administration, and other campus constituencies, as appropriate. These constituencies vary considerably by position and by unit; therefore, the review process will vary accordingly.

The appropriate level of faculty involvement in evaluation should be determined by the nature of the administrative post (e.g., faculty input should be weighted more heavily in the evaluation of deans and department chairs than in the evaluation of positions above the level of dean).

2. Criteria for Evaluation of Administrators The appointing officer will determine the expectations and demands of the position, and will also determine the criteria for the evaluation. The criteria must include the following:

- a. Leadership - Promotes high standards in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service; communicates priorities, standards, and administrative procedures effectively; articulates a vision for the future; communicates ideas in a clear and timely fashion to faculty, staff, and other University administrators; demonstrates listening skills; provides national and statewide visibility and recognition for the constituency; contributes to the leadership of the University and effectively advocates for all relevant constituencies.
- b. Administration and Management - Oversees the recruitment and appointment of highly qualified faculty and staff; provides support for the successful recruitment and retention of administrators, faculty, staff, and

Lab Use 8/27/08 12:59 PM

Deleted: Each administrator under review will be evaluated based on a set of criteria that reflect the nature of the division, unit, or office and the specific responsibilities of that administrator. The established review criteria will be used in addition to the clearly defined outcomes and expectations for the administrator. The criteria to be used by the members of the review committee may include the following:

students; manages the administrative office effectively; seeks input and accepts responsibility for decisions; provides for effective budget management; works effectively with other administrative officers; makes decisions in a timely fashion.

c. Diversity - Encourages diversity and implements mechanisms for attracting and retaining underrepresented groups; is responsive to cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity; demonstrates and encourages respect for all persons in the constituency and the University.

d. Collaboration – Sound practices of collaboration, openness and shared governance are essential.

In addition, the following criteria are suggested but optional to the appointing officer:

e. Planning - Works effectively with faculty, staff and other relevant constituencies in identifying appropriate short-term and long-term goals, in setting priorities, and in focusing resources across all constituencies.

f. Development - Within the context of the administrative office, works to identify and pursue philanthropic support for the constituency; develops public and constituency support for the University.

g. Personnel Development - Provides guidance, support and resources for faculty and staff development, particularly in promotion, tenure and evaluation; demonstrates equitable judgment and action.

h. Assessment - Effectively evaluates or assesses the units under his/her administration, acknowledges areas of excellence, and recommends areas where improvement is needed.

i. Academic Freedom - Supports and defends academic freedom as defined in the ECU Faculty Manual and in the Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina.

j. Teaching - Supports and fosters a climate that promotes excellence in teaching.

k. Research/Creative Activity - Supports and fosters a climate that promotes excellence in research/creative activities.

l. Patient Care - Supports and fosters a climate that promotes an excellence in patient care.

m. Service - Participates and encourages service activities related to the fulfillment of the University's mission.

3. Timeframe

The reviewing officer shall inform the internal constituencies of the need for a Review Committee by September 1 of the 5th year of the administrator's appointment. The Committee will present its final report to the reviewing officer by February 15 of that academic year.

4. Structure

The appointing officer will determine the process and guidelines for the review following appropriate input from constituencies. Each process depends on the expectations of the position, input from constituencies and the needs of the institution. For instance, there is significant variation among units and this variation directly affects the constituency participation. Input from Pitt County

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:04 PM

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:04 PM

Deleted: d

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:04 PM

Deleted: e

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:00 PM

Deleted: f

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:04 PM

Deleted: g

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:04 PM

Deleted: h

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:01 PM

Deleted: i. Shared Governance - Supports the principle of shared governance; adheres to the policies of the ECU Faculty Manual and other established University policies.

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:14 PM

Deleted: The Review Committee

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:15 PM

Deleted: To be eligible to serve on a Review Committee, a faculty member must meet the definition of voting faculty in Appendix L of the ECU Faculty Manual.

For the evaluation of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences and Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, the Review Committee will be selected in the following way:

- a. The reviewing officer will designate a committee of at least 6 persons and no more than 10.
- b. At least 50% of this committee will be voting faculty members belonging to the entire constituency of the office whose administrator is under review, elected by the Faculty Senate from a slate provided by the Committee on Committees.
- c. The Committee on Committees, in consultation with the reviewing officer, will provide a slate of faculty candidates for each committee representing the appropriate constituencies for the administrator being reviewed.
- d. The remainder of the committee (50%) will be appointed by the reviewing officer. The reviewing officer will also designate a chairperson from the committee membership.

For the review of Deans, Academic Associate Deans, Deans of Academic Library Services and the Health Sciences Library, the Review Committee will be selected in the following way:

- a. The reviewing officer will designa... [1]

Memorial Hospital would be vital in the evaluation of the dean of the medical school, while the input of the S. Rudolph Alexander Performing Arts Series is necessary in the assessment of the dean of the College of Fine Arts and Communication. Multiple forms of faculty input will be sought to ensure confidential and complete feedback on the administrator under review. Such input may be obtained through numerous methods, including forums, surveys and formal presentations.

5. Procedures

The Appointing Officer is responsible for determining the procedures to be followed in the review, consistent with the principles of openness, collaboration and shared governance. The Appointing Officer also must ensure that all relevant constituencies have an opportunity to offer input during the review. The entire process is collaborative among the Appointing Officer and members of the unit, including, for instance, assistant deans, staff, and students.

6. Review Reporting

Before the final report is given to the reviewing officer, a draft of the report will be given to the administrator under review. It is appropriate to invite the administrator under review for an informal discussion of the findings. He or she shall be invited to prepare a written response. If he or she should choose to do so then any such response should be included with the final written report. The report should:

- a. Describe the main premises governing the report.
- b. State the results of the survey instrument. The results will be analyzed as to the views of each group of faculty (tenured, tenured-track, fixed term).
- c. State what information was used, and the sources of this information in assessing performance in relation to the standards of evaluation.
- d. Provide a description of the strengths and the weaknesses of administrator, make suggestions for improvement, and recommend actions ranging from commendation to termination.

After meeting with the officer under review the Review Committee will provide its final report to the reviewing officer.

ATTACHMENT

The administrative portfolio for the Review Committee may include the following documents and statements:

1. Documents

- a. updated C.V.
- b. unit strategic planning progress reports during the review period;
- c. annual reports for the unit during the review period;
- d. administrator's annual report during the review period;
- e. annual administrator evaluation survey results during the review period (if such surveys are conducted for the officer under review) I.e. IDEA survey;
- f. annual personnel evaluations by the supervisor of the officer under review performed during the review period. "

Lab Use 8/27/08 1 15 PM

Deleted:

Lab Use 8/27/08 1 50 PM

Deleted: The Review Committee is responsible for conducting its evaluation in accordance with the criteria established in Section 2. The Review Committee is also responsible for the following procedural aspects of the review:

- a. Meet with the reviewing officer to whom it reports. In this meeting there should be a statement by the reviewing officer of the job expectations, goals, major constraints, factors, and specific areas for review affecting the administrator under review during the preceding five years. The reviewing officer will also provide advice about persons to consult and the expected timeline for the review.
- b. Meet with the officer under review. At this time, the officer under review will submit the administrative performance portfolio (attachment), and may also suggest additional persons to consult. Further communication is permitted.
- c. To obtain faculty input, the review committee will administer a "survey instrument" that is based on the evaluation criteria as specified in Section 2 and includes a summative evaluation question.
- d. Before the survey is administered, the officer under review gives a presentation to the faculty based on the contents of the portfolio. This presentation may include the following:
 - i. leadership philosophy, strategies, and methodologies;
 - ii. attempted innovations and assessment of their effectiveness;
 - iii. a statement of objectives for the future of the administrative unit;The presentation will also be made available to all faculty in written form.
- e. The committee may gather other information as suggested by the reviewing officer, the officer under review or at its own discretion; including, if appropriate, reviews by ... [2]

Lab Use 8/27/08 1 47 PM

Deleted:

Lab Use 8/27/08 1 50 PM

Deleted: 7. After the review The reviewing officer will inform the officer under review and forward the report and his/her recommendation to the Chancellor. The reviewing officer shall provide a summary of the procedures, principles, criteria, and action taken to the appropriate constituency in compliance with NC General Statutes #126-23.

Lab Use 8/27/08 1 45 PM

Deleted: shall

Lab Use 8/27/08 1 45 PM

Deleted: v

2. Statements

The administrative portfolio may include a reflective statement describing the officer under review's:

- a. personal leadership development plan
- b. administrative and leadership philosophy, strategies, and methodologies;
- c. attempted innovations and assessment of their effectiveness;
- d. statement of objectives for the future of the administrative unit;
- e. written summary statement prepared by the officer under review that documents his or her performance during the review period. The summary statement shall address the evaluation standards referenced in Section 2 above.

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:45 PM

Deleted: T

Lab Use 8/27/08 1:45 PM

Deleted: shall