RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FACULTY SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF ADMINISTRATORS
Draft, February 3, 1993

PURPOSES

The procedures that we recommend are designed to serve the following purposes:

1. to facilitate communication between faculty and administration by providing a forum that stimulates the independent expression of views of faculty members on administrative performance;
2. to provide information to administrators for the purpose of self-evaluation and improvement of performance;
3. to provide faculty input to the Chancellor and the deans respectively in their evaluation of the performance of deans and associate deans;
4. to exercise faculty governance; and
5. to include administrators in a process of review analogous to what faculty experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the faculty in cooperation with the office of the Secretary of the Faculty institute periodic evaluations of UWM chancellors, deans, and associate deans.

2. We recommend that a five-member faculty committee for the evaluation of administrators (FCEA) be elected annually with no more than two members from one school or college. Staggered three-year terms are recommended. The function of this committee will be the evaluation of administrators.

3. We recommend that deans and associate deans of each of UWM's eleven decanal units* be evaluated by their constituent faculties (as defined by the FCEA) every five years on a staggered basis, e.g., year 1: Schools of Allied Health Professions and of Architecture and Urban Planning; year 2: Schools of Business Administration and of Education, etc.

4. We recommend that each year the FCEA in cooperation with the deans and associate deans to be evaluated that year design a questionnaire, which the FCEA will distribute to all constituent faculty members before the end of the first semester. The questionnaire will be based on the sample contained in the appendix to this document. Faculty members will comment on aspects of deans and associate deans' performance under rubrics approved by the administrators themselves, indicate their level of satisfaction with the administrators' performance, and state whether they favor the administrators' reappointment.

5. We recommend the following use of the completed questionnaires. The questionnaires will be returned to the FCEA. Members of the FCEA with the help of a designated member of the Secretary of the University's staff will compile a summary of the results of the questionnaires. Summaries will include the number and percentage of faculty responding. The questionnaires and the summaries will be confidential. The summaries will be distributed to the administrators evaluated and to their immediate supervisors. In addition, administrators evaluated shall have a closed meeting or series of closed meetings with all the chairpersons (or equivalent unit heads) in their constituent faculties to discuss the results of the evaluation. Summaries of the evaluation will be shown to the chairpersons or other unit heads at these meetings and the issues raised by them shall be thoroughly discussed. Chairpersons or other unit heads will be allowed to view the original questionnaires in order to follow up issues raised by the questionnaires. Completed questionnaires will be kept on file during the academic year of the evaluation and destroyed afterwards.

6. We recommend that the FCEA institute a similar process for the periodic evaluation of chancellors. The process should be defined during the academic year of 1995/96 and completed in the academic year of 1996/97. Chancellors should be evaluated within five years of their appointment and every five years thereafter.
Appendix: Model Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Administrators

EVALUATION OF THE DEAN

The Faculty Committee for the Evaluation of Administrators seeks your comments on the performance of Dean .................. Please indicate your judgement on his/her performance by circling the appropriate responses and adding your comments.

1. Vision of the future of the School of ..........

   Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

2. Effectiveness with UWM Administrators

   Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

3. Supporting teaching

   Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

4. Supporting research

   Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

5. Explaining budgets

   Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

6. Supporting shared governance

   Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

7. Promoting recruitment of well-qualified faculty

   Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement
8. Retention of well-qualified faculty

Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

9. Promoting diversity in students and faculty

Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

10. Effectiveness in communicating with faculty

Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor  Inadequate Basis for Judgement

11. Overall satisfaction

Very satisfied  Satisfied  Dissatisfied  Very dissatisfied

Would you recommend his/her reappointment?

Yes  No  Inadequate basis for judgement