Recommendations of the Senate Subcommittee on the Evaluation of Administrators (SSEA):

1. That the attached questionnaires be used in the evaluations of the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor and Provost, to be carried out during the academic year, 1996-97.

2. That the copies of the resulting SSEA report on the evaluation of the Chancellor be sent to President Katharine C. Lyall, to the Chancellor, and to the University Committee.

3. That copies of the SSEA report on the evaluation of the Vice Chancellor and Provost be sent to the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, and to the University Committee.

4. That in all other respects, the procedures used in the evaluation process be the same as those used for other campus administrators, in accord with Faculty Document 1863, 2nd Revision, November 19, 1993.

Background

Recommendation 6 of Faculty Document 1863 instructs this committee to define the process to be used in the evaluation of the Chancellor, noting that the resulting process is to be carried out during the academic year of 1996-97 and every five years thereafter.

As a general principle, the committee felt that the procedures should be as uniform as possible throughout the process, from the evaluation of the Chancellor to that of an associate dean. Certain allowances must, of course, be made for differences in the duties associated with the various offices. The committee invites the administrator being evaluated to submit any additional questions that refer to specific duties or to suggest dropping other questions that are not relevant to the expectations of his or her office. In this case, both the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor suggested a number of changes. For example, the Chancellor suggested a statement on teaching: “The Chancellor supports teaching and an effective teaching environment at UWM.” The Vice Chancellor’s version: “The Provost has provided and fostered an effective teaching environment at the University.” The range of responses for these questionnaires would go from Agree Strongly to Disagree Strongly. The committee felt that posing the issues this way, in terms of positive statements, would prejudice the results, inclining them toward the positive. Therefore, the committee chose to follow the format of the Model Questionnaire included with Document 1863: “Supporting teaching,” which calls for responses ranging from “excellent” to “poor.”

While trying insofar as possible to incorporate the specific topics suggested by the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, the committee felt in a few cases that the issues could best be dealt with by splitting them into two areas. For example, the Vice Chancellor suggested a statement to the effect that “The Provost provides effective leadership and vision for the university.” The committee changed this to parallel the Chancellor’s questionnaire and split it into two issues: “1. Providing direction for the future of the university. 2. Providing leadership for the university.”
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EVALUATION OF CHANCELLOR JOHN SCHROEDER

1. Providing direction for the future of the university.
2. Providing leadership for the university.
3. Effectiveness in representing UWM to the community.
4. Developing and encouraging partnerships with business, government and community organizations.
5. Supporting teaching.
6. Supporting research.
7. Supporting extramural funding.
8. Supporting public service to the community and respective professions.
10. Supporting shared governance.
11. Making appropriate use of recommendations of governance bodies.
12. Promoting recruitment of well-qualified faculty.
13. Promoting retention of well-qualified faculty.
14. Promoting recruitment and retention of students.
15. Promoting diversity among students, faculty and staff.
16. Effectiveness in communicating with faculty.
17. Keeping the faculty informed on important issues.
18. Fostering a climate of trust and mutual respect.
19. Willingness to meet with various groups.
20. Responding constructively to criticism.
22. Overall satisfaction with the Chancellor’s performance.
23. Would you recommend his reappointment?
24. Please add any further comments you may have on the Chancellor’s performance, using additional pages as necessary.
Evaluation of Provost and Vice Chancellor Kenneth L. Watters

1. Providing direction for the future of the university.
2. Providing leadership for the university.
3. Developing appropriate priorities in carrying out the duties of his office.
4. Effectiveness in communicating the goals of the university.
5. Supporting teaching.
6. Supporting research.
7. Encouraging service programs of the university within the university.
8. Encouraging service programs of the university in the community and profession.
9. Supporting professional development of the faculty.
10. Supporting extramural funding.
11. Effectiveness in working with the Chancellor in representing UWM to the community.
12. Promoting recruitment of well-qualified faculty.
13. Promoting retention of well-qualified faculty.
14. Promoting recruitment and retention of students.
15. Promoting diversity among students, faculty and staff.
16. Effectiveness in communicating with faculty.
17. Keeping faculty informed on important issues.
18. Explaining budget issues.
19. Consulting deans and appropriate governance bodies regarding budgets.
20. Willingness to explain reasons for decisions.
21. Fostering a climate of trust and mutual respect.
22. Actively supporting affirmative action.
23. Openness to suggestions.
24. Openness to new opportunities.
25. Responding constructively to criticism.
27. Would you recommend his reappointment?
28. Please add any further comments you may have on the Provost's performance, using additional pages as necessary.