<div align="center">

Motion to be presented to Faculty Senate 5/17/11
Evaluation Coordinating Committee Guidelines and Suggested Procedures

</div>

Motion:
The Faculty Senate Executive Committee unanimously recommends acceptance of the following suggested procedures.

Suggested Procedures:
The Evaluation Coordinating Committee (ECC) has established a regular schedule for evaluating each administrator every four to five years. At its first meeting, the committee in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee decides which senior administrators to evaluate. The list of eligible administrators is defined in two documents: the 1994 "structure and procedures" and the 1996-97 "resolutions." With the evolution of position titles and responsibilities, the ECC needs to review the list of those senior administrators "who have significant responsibilities involving them in the academic program." The ECC believes that these currently include, but are not limited to, the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Research, all Deans, the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Vice Provost for International Education, the Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services, and the Director of Continuing Education and Outreach.

When evaluating Deans, the ECC may consult with established faculty groups in developing the survey instrument. Administration and analysis of the instrument will be conducted by the ECC.

The ECC elects a chair at its first meeting. The chair informs the administrator(s) being evaluated and requests documentation. Requested materials include a job description, a condensed resume, and a narrative self-evaluation guided by the areas to be evaluated. This information will be shared with the faculty as part of the evaluation. The ECC may also review other documentation relative to the evaluation; it may solicit data from other academic administrators and appropriate external sources.

The ECC designs a questionnaire for general evaluations based on models in the Faculty Senate files and on the instrument (adapted from Miller et al) in the 1994 "structure and procedures." The ECC adds questions tailored to administrator being evaluated. The questionnaire is sent to the administrator's natural faculty constituency and staff, his or her peers, and the faculty at-large. The ECC will use an electronic survey method that guarantees anonymity of responses.

The ECC collects results from all individuals participating in an administrator's evaluation and compiles them into a final report, which will contain:

1. a summary of the process used to generate the report,
2. a summary of the quantitative and narrative evaluations submitted by individuals, and
3. a summary statement of findings in the evaluation.

The final report will aggregate responses in a way that preserves the anonymity of individual respondents.

The ECC report is made available for view by the current members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and forwarded to the administrator being evaluated and to that person's immediate supervisor. The administrator may submit a response to the ECC. The ECC will forward these commentaries to all recipients of its original report.

When an administrator who was evaluated leaves the university, the Faculty Senate secretary shreds that person's evaluation.

The ECC has no other responsibilities.

Explanation:
The Faculty Senate Executive Committee asked the current Evaluation Coordinating Committee to review the guidelines for evaluation and amend them to reflect current and recent practice. The original Resolutions were passed in 1996-97 prior to evaluation of any administrators. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee approved updates in 2004. Over the fifteen years of experience with evaluations, a set of practices has evolved that are followed from year to year and changes in technology have altered cost and confidentiality concerns.

The ECC's proposed guideline revision streamlines the guidelines from 14 pages to a single page of procedures which describes current and recent practice. The list of administrators to be evaluated has been updated to reflect current administration organization and titles. Since evaluations are not tied to terms in office, references to recommendations by the ECC for renewal or non-renewal have been dropped.

The major changes in the guidelines relate to the evaluation of deans. The original guidelines specified a very complex process of evaluation of deans by evaluation committees chosen by the units and overseen by the ECC. Several of the profession schools have in the past forwarded evaluations conducted by internal groups to the ECC, but there has never been an evaluation of a Dean of Harpur College using the complex procedure described in the original document (no one has remained in the position long enough to come up for review). In recent years, the evaluations of Deans, as well as those of University-wide administrators, have been conducted by the ECC according to the procedures outlined above.

For reasons of continuity, the ECC recommends that the option of the evaluation being conducted by a group from the unit be dropped. It seems better to use a similar instrument (modified for the individual circumstances) and similar procedures for all evaluations. The ECC will consult with faculty of the unit in individualizing the evaluation questionnaire for a particular Dean. The ECC also recommends sending Dean evaluations to all voting faculty as is done for evaluations of university wide positions. Deans are public figures with presence beyond their immediate unit, and various faculty throughout the University may have useful feedback on their performance. Questions have a "no basis to judge" response option and the survey technology allows viewing responses by respondent categories so that the responses of faculty in the unit can be analyzed separately from faculty not in the unit. Sending the evaluation survey to all faculty seems preferable to strictly limiting respondents to the unit or adding some additional respondents in an ad hoc manner.