

**Attachment 7**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate**  
**Summary and Rationale for Proposed Changes**

**Administrative Evaluation Policy**

**UH Sections B123.1, 123.6, 123.7, 123.11, 123.12**

**April 21, 2009**

**Overview.** Parts of Section B123 were revised in response to comments and suggestions by Faculty Senators. Questions also have been addressed, but without changes, to Sections C41.4 and C157.5. Questions and responses are noted.

## **B123**

### **At first reading, B123.1 read...**

**B123.1** The term of office of department/unit heads, associate deans, and assistant deans, who report to the dean, hold faculty rank, and have supervisory or budgetary authority (referred to as academic administrators for purposes of clarity) will be specifically determined at the time of appointment but shall not exceed five years in length. Reappointment to additional terms is possible. Individuals in these positions serve at the pleasure of the dean who determines whether or not annual reappointment is appropriate. Reappointment to additional terms must include opportunity for input and due consideration of the views from the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff being served.

**Comments:** Senator Dodd commented that B123.11 needed to differentiate between the advisory vote of faculty in reappointment of department heads, assistant and associate deans and the binding vote of faculty in the reappointment of chairs. The senator also offered language that clarifies this difference.

Another senator requested that the language of B123.11 be amended to show that the faculty vote is advisory.

The first revision of B123.1 declared that the administrator should have the support of the majority of the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff under his/her supervision, but did not describe how the vote would be taken to determine and document the majority.

**Action:** It was decided that B123.1, which provides an overview of the procedure, is the appropriate place for guidance on whether votes are advisory or binding. Therefore, language that Senator Dodd recommended was added and some of the language from B123.11 was moved to B123.1. In addition, a provision for a secret ballot was included in B123.1.

**The recommendation from FAC is to approve B123.1, as revised, with changes noted in italics. If approved, B123.1 will read as follows.**

**B123.1** The term of office of department/unit heads, associate deans, and assistant deans, who report to the dean, hold faculty rank, and have supervisory or budgetary authority (referred to as academic administrators for purposes of clarity) will be specifically determined at the time of appointment but shall

not exceed five years. Individuals in these positions serve at the pleasure of the dean who determines whether or not annual reappointment is appropriate, *subject to the approval of the president*. These academic administrators are eligible for reappointment to additional terms of up to five years. *To be reappointed, the administrator should have the support of the majority of the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff under his/her supervision, as documented by a vote, which is advisory and taken in a secret ballot, and the concurrence of the dean*. Prior to reappointing an administrator to an additional term, the dean shall, in consultation with the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff being served, establish an advisory committee representative of the department or unit to obtain input from the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff being served, and provide the dean an advisory recommendation. *The dean shall consider the advisory committee's recommendation before reappointing an administrator. In the case of department chairs, the vote is not advisory, since chairs are directly elected by their faculty rather than appointed by the dean.*

**There were no comments or changes to B 123.2, B123.4 and B123.5.**

**At first reading, B123.6 read...**

***B123.6*** The reappointment advisory committee will be appointed by the dean and will reflect recommendations from the group served. The reappointment advisory committee, composed of faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff members who are representative of the groups served, shall act in an advisory capacity to the dean. Students, alumni, and representatives of other university-related groups may also be named as members of the reappointment advisory committee.

**Comments:** Senator Frieman asked for clarification as to whether the dean appoints the advisory committee or must the dean consider a list of names submitted by the members of the unit.

A senator commented to me that the committee selection process should not take away the dean's discretion to invite persons who are may not have been recommended initially to serve on the committee.

**Action:** B123.6 was revised to incorporate the comments.

**The recommendation from FAC is to approve B123. 6, as revised, with changes indicated by italic font. If approved, section B123.6 will read as follows:**

***B123.6*** *During the last year of the academic administrator's tenure, the dean of the college will request that the group served recommend a list of faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff member serve on the academic administrator's reappointment advisory committee. The dean will review the list to ensure that the committee is representative of the groups served then select a committee is representative of the groups serve.* Students, alumni, and representatives of other university-related groups may also be named as members of the reappointment advisory committee.

**At first reading B123.7 read...**

The reappointment advisory committee, with the aid of administrative support staff (administrative staff can include the Office of Planning and Analysis or another group empowered by the dean), will collect feedback for the review. The method of feedback shall provide opportunity for input on performance relative to established missions and goals, and on the overall effectiveness of and confidence in the department/unit head, associate dean, or assistant dean.

**Comments:** Senator Gould mentioned there is a the lack of uniformity in collecting input, noting that some use surveys with rating scales and open-ended questions, which the senator opined is secure and a great tool, while others use e-mail. The senator’s experience is that each method can breach privacy and anonymity because the survey often asks for the respondent’s rank or title and e-mail is not secure, confidential or anonymous. The senator opined that respondents would feel more comfortable responding if there were assurances of privacy and anonymity. Without specifying language the senator recommended he language might state ...“ that the technical solution used to gather input about the administrator must guarantee anonymity and hopefully everyone understands that e-mail would not be the way to go or it states that e-mail cannot be used to gather input.”

**Action:** Phrases have been inserted in B123.7 that address Senator Gould’s comments.

**Accordingly, the recommendation from FAC is to approve inserted phrases shown in italics so that, if approved, section B123.7 will read as follows:**

**B123.7** The reappointment advisory committee, with the aid of administrative support staff (administrative staff can include the Office of Planning and Analysis or another group empowered by the dean), will collect feedback for the review. The *method used to collect the feedback shall ensure the privacy and anonymity of respondents*, provide opportunity for input on performance relative to established missions and goals, and on the overall effectiveness of and confidence in the department/unit head, associate dean, or assistant dean.

**There were no comments or changes to B123.8, B123.9 and B123.10.**

**At first reading, B123.11 read...**

**B123.11** To be reappointed, the administrator should have, by a majority, the support of the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff under his/her supervision as well as the concurrence of the dean. The committee’s recommendations are advisory in nature. The final decision resides with the dean, subject to the approval of the provost. If the dean’s decision as to reappointment is contrary to a recommendation from a majority of the committee, he or she will meet with the committee members to explain the reasons for not accepting the committee’s recommendations.

**Comments:** It was decided that B123.1, which provides an overview of the procedure, is the appropriate place for guidance on whether votes are advisory or binding. Therefore, language that Senator Dodd recommended was added and some of the language from B123.11 was moved to B123.1.

Senator Frieman commented that B123.11 suggests a vote will be taken, but there is no mechanism described for how this is done. He requested text describing how this vote is taken and reported.

**The recommendation from FAC is to approve the following version of B123.11 which, if approved, will read as follows:**

**B123.11.** *To solicit and document the votes of the group served, the reappointment advisory committee in consultation with the Office of Planning and Analysis or another group empowered by the dean shall develop a secure survey instrument that protects the privacy and anonymity of respondents and can be administered and scored online. The survey shall provide for narrative comments, ratings of specific performance areas listed on the self-evaluation, plus any unit-specific performance areas and for a vote of Yes, No or Abstain in answer to the questions of whether the administrator should be reappointed. The data will be compiled and presented so that summary and other statistics will be standard outputs, along*

*with an anonymous listing of the narrative comments. A summary of respondents' input will be provided to the committee for its report to the dean.*

**At first reading, B123.12 read...**

**B123.12** The dean will meet with faculty and staff of the department or unit to announce the outcome and discuss relevant issues.

**Comments:** Senator Frieman noted the need to clarify that the group served makes the advisory recommendation.

**Action:** I revised the language to clarify the advisory role of the faculty.

**The recommendation from FAC is to approve the following version of B123.12 which, if approved, will read as follows:**

To be reappointed, the administrator should *have the support of the majority of the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff under his/her supervision as well as the concurrence of the dean. If the dean's decision as to reappointment is contrary to a recommendation from a majority of the faculty, unclassified professionals, and other staff under the administrator's supervision, the dean will meet with the committee and faculty and staff of the department or unit to announce the outcome, discuss relevant issues and explain the reasons for not accepting the faculty recommendation.*

## **C41**

**At first reading, C41.4(a) read...**

**C41.4(a)** Performance evaluations of all heads/chairs/directors and other administrative supervisors in academic and non-academic departments/units are completed annually for merit increases. Input from individuals under their supervision or outside input may be solicited from other faculty, unclassified professionals, classified staff, and clientele *as specified in the department's/unit's evaluation system.* The purpose of this input would be to identify strengths and weaknesses and issues relevant to the administrator's annual performance.

**Comment:** Senator Frieman asked, "Does the italicized phrase [see above] refer to the immediately preceding list of people or to the procedures for merit evaluation in a unit's document?"

**Response:** The phrase refers to the list of people.

**At first reading, C41.4(b) read...**

**C41.4(b)** . At least once every five years, the responsible dean, vice-president, provost or president (See Note 1), as appropriate, depending upon the department's/unit's reporting structure, will issue a request for input from individuals regarding the performance of their department/unit administrator(s). Individuals designated as participants would include: unclassified professionals and/or classified staff under their supervision. Outside input should include an appropriate representative spectrum of persons outside the department/unit, i.e. clientele, faculty, unclassified professionals, other classified staff, and students whose input could be beneficial in establishing performance of the department/unit administrator. *The mechanisms and frequency for soliciting outside input on the department/unit administrator's performance will be specified in the department's/unit's evaluation system.* If a reappointment advisory committee is to be used please see the process detailed in B123. The dean, vice president, provost or

president should ensure that those eligible for providing input are informed about the context of the mission and objectives of the department/unit. The specific source of all input will be held in absolute confidence by the dean, vice-president, provost or president. The verbatim comments will be edited to preserve confidentiality, before transmitting them to the person being evaluated.

**Comment:** Senator Frieman notes, “Although this language [see italic font above] is in the current Handbook, I suspect those procedures currently are not in many department document. They are not in my department’s document.”

**Response:** We conclude that Senator Frieman’s observation is correct.

**C157.5** After the materials have been administered, the provost will select and appoint an advisory committee. The advisory committee selection process will involve consultation with the dean, elected faculty senators, and a faculty council if the college has one. The committee will represent each academic discipline (or departments in smaller colleges), and reflect race and gender to the extent possible. As a general practice, only tenured faculty and no more than one department head will serve on the advisory committee. With the approval of the provost, the committee membership may be expanded by the addition of representation from non-faculty groups who are served by the college (including students, unclassified professionals, classified staff, or clients of the college).

**Comment:** Senator Frieman asks to what does the phrase ‘academic discipline’ refer? He then answers his question, indicating that it refers to natural sciences, social sciences, humanities.

**Answer:** Senator Frieman is correct.