REVISED POLICY FOR FACULTY EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATOR

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 appropriate appointing office concerning the performance of the Chancellor, the Provost/Vice Chancellor, the deans and the 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 University and in consultation with the appropriate appointing officer participate in periodic evaluation of the UWM Chancellor, Provost/Vice Chancellor, deans and associate deans.

2. We recommend that a five-member Senate Subcommittee for the Evaluation of Administrators (SSEA) 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 coordination/administration of the faculty evaluation of administrators.

3. We recommend the Chancellor and deans of UWM's decanal units be evaluated by their constituent faculties (as defined by the SSEA) upon completion of 4 years of service and every 4 years thereafter. The Provost/Vice Chancellor will be evaluated at the same time as the Chancellor and the associate deans at the same time as their dean.

4. We recommend that the SSEA design an evaluation procedure in consultation with the administrator, the appropriate appointing officer, and a member of the faculty group chosen to receive the committee's summary report. The procedure should include, at minimum, a questionnaire in which faculty are asked to commend on and indicate their level of satisfaction with the administrator's performance. The questionnaire is to be
distributed to all constituent faculty members and collected before the end of the first semester. Sample questionnaires are contained in the appendix.

5. We recommend the following use of the completed evaluation materials (i.e. questionnaires and any other data or information solicited from the faculty by the SSEA.) Members of the SSEA with the help of a designated member of the Secretary of the University's staff will compile a summary report of the results of the submitted evaluations. The summary report will include the number and percentage of faculty responding. The summary report will be distributed to the administrator evaluated, the immediate appointing officer, and to a designated preexisting faculty group. In the case of the Chancellor and Provost/Vice Chancellor this will be the University Committee. In the case of the deans and associate deans it will be a group, such as the chairs or the academic and budget planning committee of the decanal unit, as specified and made known by the dean. Evaluated administrators shall have a closed meeting or a series of closed meetings to discuss the results of the evaluation with the specified group and the issues raised by them shall be thoroughly discussed. The SSEA summary report will be sent to the appropriate appointing officer as part of the entire performance review he/she will conduct of the administrator. Completed evaluation materials will be kept on file for one year and destroyed afterwards.

6. We recommend the SSEA summary report be made available in the University Committee office to all members of the faculty in the unit of the administrator being evaluated. The summary report should be considered a confidential personnel document with faculty members in the unit of the administrator being evaluated included among those who have a legitimate need to see the summary report.

7. We recommend the faculty evaluation be coordinated with and be part of a periodic comprehensive review of the administrators by their appointing officer.

Rationale:

The aims of this proposal are to simplify, clarify, and improve the current policies on the evaluation of administrators as incorporated in Faculty Documents 1863 and 2046. This proposal collapses the Doc. 1963 and Doc. 2046 into one comprehensive document dealing with all administrators. It both serves to simplify the legislation as well as make clear the original intent of the legislation to include the Chancellor and the Provost/Vice Chancellor positions. Doc. 2046 specifically concerns the 1996 evaluations of John Schroeder and Ken Watters.

Most of the changes concern clarification of ambiguities, eliminating inconsistencies, and spelling out procedures more precisely. There are also some substantive changes. The following highlights and explains what is new in this proposal:

A. Purposes

The statement of purposes remains the same. The only change occurs in #3 to indicate the legislation applies to the Chancellor and the Provost/Vice Chancellor.

B. Recommendations

1. Changed to include the Chancellor and Provost/Vice Chancellor. (Similar changes, where needed, are made throughout the recommendations.)
2. Change the name of the committee to "The Senate Subcommittee for the Evaluation of Administrators" "(SSEA)" for uniformity.
3. Changed for clarification.
4. Changed to allow for information in addition to the questionnaire to be solicited from the faculty and to specify more precisely the consultation procedures for developing the evaluation instrument(s). The requirement that the questionnaire include an item on whether faculty favor the reappointment of the administrator was dropped. It was thought this question was not needed given the extensive information the evaluation provides, and the "eye catching" nature of the question may make it, rather than the full assessment the focus of attention.
5. In keeping with Doc. 2046, specify that the group to which the SSEA report on the Chancellor and the Provost/Vice Chancellor be sent is the University Committee.
6. Old #6 dropped, as it is no longer needed.
   New #6 recommends that the SSEA summary report be made available to the faculty in the unit of the administrator being evaluated. We believe the evaluation process has now been shown to work reasonably well, and so many qualms about the wider distribution of the summary report no longer remain. Withholding the summary report from the relevant faculty seemed to inhibit not improve the process. We also believe that the summary report probably falls under the Wisconsin Open Records law and is thus legally subject to wider availability.
7. Changed to include all administrators, but dropped specifics as to the nature of the appointing officers evaluation instruments.
C. Sample questionnaires

1. Drop questions about reappointment, as noted in changes to recommendation #4.

2. Add to Dean's questionnaire:
   (i) "Fostering a climate of trust and mutual respect."
   (ii) "Maintaining and respecting the intellectual standards of the School/College and its faculty."

3. Add to Chancellor and the Provost/Vice Chancellor questionnaires:
   "Maintaining and respecting the intellectual standards of the University and its faculty."

These questions have been used in previous evaluations, and it was thought useful to include them in the samples provided with this proposal.