Administrator Evaluation

Mr. Gilbert called on President Funderburk to explain the proposed procedures and forms intended for use in evaluation of academic and other administrators. President Funderburk indicated that methods of evaluation had been in use for several years, essentially being "tested." He said that the Faculty Senate had recently approved the procedures and form for use in evaluation of academic administrators and that the procedures and form for the evaluation of other administrators had been patterned very closely after those for academic administrators. Mr. Gilbert noted that the committee had also reviewed the evaluation material and supported its adoption. Ms. Hacker made a motion for approval of the administrator evaluation procedures and forms and the motion was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried by voice vote. The procedures and forms approved for use in academic and other administrator evaluations are copied on the following pages.
EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

The major thrust of the evaluation of academic administrators shall be to improve the effectiveness of Eastern Kentucky University's academic administration. To accomplish this, the evaluation process shall require the active support and appraisal from all persons in a position to express valid viewpoints in the performance of individual administrators. These evaluations shall be conducted in a fair and objective manner. All information shall be treated in an appropriately professional manner.

The evaluation procedures in this document are in addition to the annual merit pay evaluations of all academic administrators.

All administrators at Eastern Kentucky University serve with annual appointments and at the pleasure of the President and Board of Regents. It should be understood throughout this document that all decisions regarding appointment or reappointment of academic administrators require approval at this level.

General Principles and Procedures

1. The immediate supervisors of the evaluatee shall have overall responsibility for the preparation of the evaluation.

2. Each administrator being evaluated shall prepare a self-appraisal report covering the period of time since the last evaluation.

3. Primary evaluation input will be requested from all individuals who work directly with the evaluatee. These data shall be solicited on the standard Appraisal of Administrative Activity Questionnaire. Questions may be added to the questionnaire provided they are approved by the immediate supervisor of the evaluatee one year in advance. All completed questionnaires (whether signed or unsigned) shall be treated confidentially and shall be used by the recipients of the questionnaires in evaluating the administrator. To the extent possible, identifiable information and comments will not be provided to the administrator being evaluated; however, the recipients of the questionnaires shall review and utilize all questionnaires to prepare evaluation reports and recommendations.

4. Since the focus of administrative evaluations is the improvement of administration, evaluation reports shall include specific recommendations. The evaluatee's response to these recommendations shall be one basis for the annual merit review process and future evaluations.

I. Administrative Evaluation of Department Chairs

A. A department chair, tenured or non-tenured, shall be evaluated during the second and fourth year of service and every four years thereafter. In unusual circumstances, if requested by the chair or the departmental faculty, and with the concurrence of the Dean, the chair may be evaluated more frequently. In addition, the President, Vice President, or Dean may request more frequent evaluations.

B. The teaching faculty of each academic department shall determine whether or not the department shall have a Chair-Evaluation Committee by majority vote using a secret ballot.

C. Each academic department which so chooses shall establish a Chair-Evaluation Committee. The membership of this committee shall be determined by a majority vote of the department faculty. However,
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1. If the chair is being evaluated as a non-tenured faculty member, the Chair-Evaluation Committee and the Non-Tenure Evaluation Committee shall be the same;

2. If the chair is being evaluated for tenure or promotion, the Chair-Evaluation Committee shall be the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee; and

3. If an administrative evaluation of a chair is being held during the same year as a non-tenure evaluation, or a tenure or promotion evaluation, the evaluations shall be done concurrently.

D. The Dean shall meet with the Chair-Evaluation Committee early in the year in which the evaluation is to take place to discuss the specific timetable for the evaluation, the procedures for distributing the previously approved questionnaire, and other matters related to the evaluation.

E. The duties of the Chair-Evaluation Committee shall be to:
   1. Develop, and submit to the Dean for review, additional questions which the department may wish to add to the questionnaire. (Additional questions must have been approved one year in advance of the evaluation.)
   2. Review the chair's self-appraisal report and the completed department faculty questionnaires (in keeping with the need for confidentiality) and submit a report and recommendations to the Dean.

F. All faculty in the department shall be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires shall be transmitted to the Dean of the College.

G. The Dean shall make the completed department faculty questionnaires available to the Chair-Evaluation Committee, provided the department has such a committee.

H. After reviewing the chair's self-appraisal, the questionnaires, the Chair-Evaluation Committee's report and recommendations, and other available information (e.g., questionnaires completed by other chairs in the college and other individuals who work directly with the chair), the Dean shall write an evaluation report, with recommendations. This report shall include a summary of the faculty questionnaires if there is no department Chair-Evaluation Committee.

I. The dean shall meet with the chair to discuss the Chair-Evaluation Committee's report and recommendations if such a report has been made, as well as his/her own report and recommendations, and shall provide the chair with copies of the report(s). The dean shall then transmit the report(s), including recommendations, to the Vice President.

J. The chair may submit, within five days of receiving the reports, a written response to the evaluation report(s) and recommendations to the Vice President with copies to the Dean of the College and, if appropriate, the Chair-Evaluation Committee.

II. Administrative Evaluation of Academic Deans

A. Academic deans shall be evaluated during the second and fourth year of service and every four years thereafter. In unusual circumstances, if requested by the Dean, college chairs, or college faculty, and with the concurrence of the Vice President, the Dean may be evaluated more frequently. In addition, the President or Vice President may request more frequent evaluations.
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B. All college faculty, college chairs, other deans, and other academic or support administrators who work directly with the Dean shall be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires shall be transmitted to the Associate Vice President.

C. The faculty of each college shall, by majority vote using a secret ballot, determine whether or not the college shall have a Dean-Evaluation Committee(*)

D. Each college which so chooses shall establish a Dean-Evaluation Committee. The membership of this committee shall be determined by a majority vote of the college faculty(*). However,

1. if the dean is being evaluated as a non-tenured faculty member, the Dean-Evaluation Committee and the Non-Tenure Evaluation Committee shall be the same;
2. if the dean is being evaluated for tenure or promotion, the Dean-Evaluation Committee shall be the Promotion and Tenure Committee; and
3. if an administrative evaluation of a dean is being held during the same year as a non-tenure evaluation, or a tenure or promotion evaluation, the evaluations shall be done concurrently.

E. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall meet with the Dean-Evaluation Committee early in the year in which the evaluation is to take place to discuss the specific timetable for the evaluation, the procedures for distributing the previously approved questionnaire, and other matters related to the evaluation.

F. The duties of the Dean-Evaluation Committee shall be to:

1. Develop, and submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review, additional questions which the college may wish to add to the questionnaire. (Additional questions must have been approved one year in advance of the evaluation.)
2. Review the dean’s self-appraisal report and the completed college faculty questionnaires (in keeping with the need for confidentiality) and submit a report and recommendations to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

G. The associate Vice President shall make the completed college faculty questionnaires available to the Dean-Evaluation Committee, provided the college has such a committee.

H. After reviewing the dean’s self-appraisal, the questionnaires, the Dean-Evaluation Committee’s report and recommendations, and other available information (e.g., questionnaires completed by other deans and other individuals who work directly with the dean), the Associate Vice President shall write an evaluation report, with recommendations. The Associate Vice President shall summarize the results of the questionnaires, including the faculty questionnaires if there is no Dean-Evaluation Committee, and shall transmit this summary, the questionnaires, and his/her own evaluation report and recommendations to the Vice President.

I. The Vice President shall meet with the Dean to discuss the evaluation results, as well as his/her own report and recommendations, and shall provide the Dean with copies of the the report of the Dean-Evaluation Committee (if appropriate), summary of results and a written copy of his/her own report and recommendations.

J. The Dean may submit, within five days of receiving the reports, a written response to the evaluation reports and recommendations to the President with a copy to the Vice President, and, if appropriate, the Dean-Evaluation Committee.
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Administrative Evaluation of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research

A. The Associate Vice President shall be evaluated during the second and fourth year of service and every four years thereafter. In unusual circumstances, if requested by the Associate Vice President, Academic Deans, university chairs, or university faculty, and with the concurrence of the Vice President, the Associate Vice President may be evaluated more frequently. In addition, the President or Vice President may request more frequent evaluations.

B. All faculty, chairs, Deans, and other academic or support administrators who work directly with the Associate Vice President shall be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires shall be transmitted to the Vice President.

C. The Vice President shall meet with the Associate Vice President to discuss the evaluation results, as well as his/her own report and recommendations, and shall provide the Associate Vice President with copies of the summary of results and a written copy of his/her own report and recommendations.

D. The Associate Vice President may submit, within five days of receiving the reports, a written response to the evaluation reports and recommendations to the President with a copy to the Vice President.

V. Administrative Evaluation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research

A. The Vice President shall be evaluated during the second and fourth year of service and every four years thereafter. In unusual circumstances, if requested by the Vice President, Associate Vice President, Academic Deans, university chairs, or university faculty, and with the concurrence of the President, the Vice President may be evaluated more frequently. In addition, the President may conduct more frequent evaluations.

B. All faculty, chairs, Deans, and other academic or support administrators who work directly with the Vice President shall be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires shall be transmitted to the President.

C. The President shall meet with the Vice President to discuss the evaluation results, as well as his/her own report and recommendations, and shall provide the Vice President with copies of the summary of results and a written copy of his/her own report and recommendations.

D. The Vice President may submit, within five days of receiving the reports, a written response to the evaluation reports and recommendations to the President.

V. Administrative Evaluation of academic directors and other academic administrators shall be conducted during the second and fourth year of service and every four years thereafter. In special cases, at the discretion of the immediate supervisor, more frequent evaluations may occur. The President, Vice President, or Dean may request an evaluation at any time. Procedures for these evaluations shall be established by the immediate supervisor and approved through normal administrative channels to include the Vice President.

VI. The Vice President shall submit an annual report to the President summarizing all administrative evaluation reports and recommendations.
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VII. These procedures shall be reviewed by a faculty committee during the 1993/94 academic year.

(*) During the 1990/91 academic year the college faculty shall determine (by secret ballot) whether or not there is to be a Dean-Evaluation Committee. If this vote is affirmative the procedures under which this committee shall operate shall be established by the faculty and approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs by May 1, 1991.

It shall be the responsibility of the department chairs in the college to conduct the original vote. Further, if the vote is affirmative, the department chairs of the college shall organize and conduct any open meetings and any further voting necessary to establish the procedures, and/or any additional questions to be added to the form, and to submit these to the Vice President for approval by April 15, 1991.

These procedures shall become effective beginning with the 1991/92 academic year.
PROCEDURES FOR THE

'EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS'

The major thrust of the evaluation of administrators shall be to improve the effectiveness of Eastern Kentucky University's administration. To accomplish this, the evaluation process will require the active support and input from persons in a position to express valid viewpoints on the performance of individual administrators. These evaluations will be conducted in a fair and objective manner. All information will be treated in confidence and in an appropriately professional manner.

The evaluation procedures in this document are in addition to the annual merit pay evaluations of all administrators.

General Principles and Procedures

1. The immediate supervisor of the evaluatee will have overall responsibility for the implementation of the evaluation process.

2. Primary evaluation input will be requested from individuals who work directly with the evaluatee. These data will be solicited on the standard Appraisal of Administrative Activity Questionnaire. (copy attached). All completed questionnaires will be treated confidentially and will be used by the recipients of the questionnaires in evaluating the administrator. To the extent possible, identifiable information and comments from the questionnaires will not be provided to the administrator being evaluated; however, the recipients of the questionnaires will review and utilize all questionnaires to prepare evaluation reports and recommendations.

3. Since the focus of administrative evaluations is the improvement of administration, evaluation reports shall include specific recommendations. The evaluatee's response to these recommendations shall be one basis for the annual merit review process and future evaluations.

4. Individuals affected by this policy shall be evaluated during the second and fourth year of service and every four years thereafter.

5. Every individual completing a questionnaire shall transmit it to the evaluatee's immediate supervisor.

6. Each evaluatee's immediate supervisor shall prepare a summary evaluation and meet with the evaluatee to discuss the evaluation and any appropriate recommendations. The evaluatee shall sign the summary evaluation to indicate that it has been reviewed and the summary evaluation shall be placed in the evaluatee's personnel file.

7. The evaluatee may submit, within five days of the discussion of the evaluation, a written response to the evaluation and recommendations to his/her supervisor. This response shall be placed in the evaluatee's personnel file.

*The term "administrators" as used herein includes all of those administrators not in the academic vice presidential area, that is, the President's staff and the Vice Presidents, along with appropriate administrators who report to the Vice Presidents.
Committee on the Budget: Senator Britt

Senator Britt reported that his committee had met and elected him as chair for the coming year. This committee does not have a set agenda but welcomes input from members of the Faculty Senate concerning budget matters.

Committee on the Rules: Senator MacKinnon

Senator MacKinnon stated that his committee had no report at this time.

Committee on Committees: Senator Riggs

Senator Riggs reported that this committee had met and had elected Senator Caldwell as chair for the coming year.

Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities: Senator Shearon

Senator Shearon reported that his committee had met and had elected him as chair. This committee will be working on a grievance policy during the coming year.

Committee on Legislation: Senator Calitri

Senator Calitri reported that this committee had met and that he had been elected chair for the coming year. The committee solicits input from the Faculty Senate members concerning legislation.

OLD BUSINESS

Senator LeVan moved that the Faculty Senate adopt the document entitled "Evaluation of Academic Administrators" as distributed with the agenda materials. Senator Rowlett seconded the motion. After discussion, the motion was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes.

Senator LeVan made the following motion: It is the obligation of members of the university community to provide copies of written policies and procedures whenever a Senate Committee determines that such information is desirable for its authorized considerations. The motion was seconded by Senator A. Stebbins.

Senator Baugh moved an amendment to the motion so that it would read as follows: It is the obligation of members of the university community to provide copies of written policies and procedures to a Senate Committee whenever such information is desirable for its authorized considerations. The motion to amend was seconded by Senator Falk.

The discussion concerning the proposed amendment revealed that some departments and/or colleges were reluctant to provide information to the committee reviewing merit pay procedures because some deans and chairs felt that the committee had asked for data which were inappropriate or not necessary for the committee to meet its charge, and because of some concern that the data could be misused. After lengthy discussion, the motion to amend was defeated by a voice vote. The original motion was then passed by a voice vote.
Chairperson Smith recognized Ms. Nancy Lee-Riffe who reported for the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty/Staff Handbook. The Committee has been developing a compilation of policies from the Minutes of the Faculty Senate and expected to have the project completed sometime in February. The Senate also was notified by Ms. Lee-Riffe that President Powell had appointed a committee to prepare a new addition to the Faculty/Staff Handbook with Vice President Feltner serving as chairperson of the committee. Other members of the committee are Vice President Rowlett, Chairperson Smith, Mr. Doug Whitlock and Mr. Lawrenz.

Old Business

Report of the Committee on Elections

Mr. Laird of the Senate Committee on Elections was recognized for the purpose of announcing the appointment of Ms. Eloise Warming as Observer to the Faculty Senate from the Department of Learning Skills. The Senate was informed that it was the desire of the Department to join with the College of Education as an election unit. This desire has been conveyed by the Committee on Elections to the President who has approved the proposal.

Report of the Committee on Evaluations of Administrators

Chairperson Smith recognized Mr. Heberle who moved adoption by the Senate of a report from the committee and referral of this report to the President for his consideration. Mr. Laird provided a second to the motion.

Mr. Thompson asked if the intent of the motion would be the same if the Senate were to receive the report rather than to adopt the report. Mr. Heberle replied that it would not be the same. Mr. Baechtold inquired as to the intent of paragraph II-A-5, in which all department chairpersons are requested to present their assessment of the Chairperson under evaluation. Mr. Heberle replied that several departments service many other areas of the University; therefore it was the committee's opinion that opportunities should be provided for other department chairpersons to provide their assessment of the Chairperson being evaluated. Ms. Lee-Riffe noted that the clarity of statements in the document left something to be desired and suggested some non-substantive changes which were concurred in by Mr. Heberle. Mr. Dyer questioned the use of the word "supplemented" in paragraph I-2 and inquired if the word "supplied" would be more appropriate. Mr. Heberle replied that the word "supplied" in lieu of "supplemented" would not be as appropriate because job descriptions for some University administrators are clearly stated while other job descriptions are only vaguely described. Mr. Dyer next asked about the meaning of paragraph II-B-3. Mr. Heberle replied that for reports on associate deans of colleges, the committee should submit its report to the Dean; whereas evaluations of deans should be submitted by the committee to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Mr. Dyer then noted that introductory paragraph 3, page 1 of the document, implied an apology for evaluation of administrators. Mr. Heberle stated that there was no intention to apologize for these evaluations. Ms. Gray asked about the organization of the document itself; specifically, as she understood it, Paragraph I should apply to all administrators whereas Paragraph II includes specific provisions for the evaluation of each type of administrator. Mr. Heberle indicated that her understanding was correct. Ms. Lee-Riffe suggested that within Paragraph II and

---

1The Report of the Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators was distributed to all senators, and department chairpersons along with the agenda of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 3, 1979. A copy of this report will be maintained along with the permanent record of the Minutes of this meeting.
each lettered sub-paragraph the reference to extraordinary evaluation might more properly be relocated as the last sub-paragraph. Mr. Heberle accepted this editorial change. Mr. Long stated that he was concerned about the relationship of this report vis-a-vis the report of the Planning Council; specifically Mr. Long was concerned that the two reports might be in conflict with one another and questioned the position of the Senate in such case. Mr. Heberle replied that the report of the Planning Council on the subject will be submitted to the President shortly. His committee did not know if the report would be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for its consideration, but noted that previous delays in the formation of his committee have left little time for the group to report back to the Senate. Mr. Heberle felt it most appropriate for the President to have the benefit of the committee effort. Mr. Gentry stated that the document is quite valuable but it is not a finished document because it has excluded several administrators from consideration. Mr. Heberle replied that the pressure of time has precluded more complete revision of the document and again reiterated the need for the President to see the document.

Mr. Gentry stated that he was concerned about the word "adoption" in the motion and therefore moved to amend the original motion so that the committee would receive the Report, endorse the Report in principle, and transmit the Report on the Evaluation of the Administrators to the President for his consideration. Mr. Long seconded the amendment to the motion. Mr. Laird addressing the proposed amendment noted that the committee started with a no-definition situation regarding administrators and, considering the pressure of time, this document was better than nothing. He preferred the President to have the benefit of the document. Following other senators' questions about the amended motion, Mr. Thompson asked about the Committee's thoughts on the evaluation of the President. Mr. Heberle stated that a proposed evaluation of the President was not in the report. The Committee did not come to grips with the evaluation of the President in the short period of time available and decided there was no rush as the President is serving the first part of a four-year contract. Mr. Thompson then asked if a follow-on report will be provided. Mr. Heberle replied in the negative. Mr. Thompson, noting the quite detailed set of criteria which had been provided for the evaluation of chairpersons, asked if similar criteria would be useful for deans. Mr. Heberle stated that existing job descriptions for dean and associate deans are adequate but job descriptions for chairpersons need considerable amplification and the detailed criteria were provided to overcome the deficiency. Mr. Thompson then questioned the logic of percentage variations required for extraordinary evaluation among the various levels of administrators. Mr. Heberle replied that declining required percentages were specified for higher levels of administrators due to the increasing mass of faculty affected by each higher level of administration. In response to a question from Mr. Thompson as to the frequency of extraordinary evaluations possible, Mr. Heberle stated he felt it would be impossible to accomplish more than one per year per administrator.

After further short discussion, Chairperson Smith ordered a vote on the amendment to the motion "to receive, to endorse in principle, and to pass the Report to the President." There were 26 Yes and 21 No votes on the amendment; the Senate then approved the amended motion.

New Business

Chairperson Smith recognized Mr. Barr for the purpose of presenting three proposals from the Council on Academic Affairs.
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Report of the Senate Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators

The recommendations that follow are based on the following assumptions:

1. The purpose of evaluation is the improvement of the performance of the individual academic administrator and the improvement of the academic administration of the University.

2. Evaluation of academic administrators is to be carefully distinguished from program evaluation.

3. The evaluation of academic administrators touches on sensitive areas of interpersonal relationships in the academic community and the process will not work beneficially unless it is approached in a spirit of trust and collegiality.

4. Since evaluation of academic administrators is a new activity at Eastern Kentucky University, we can best learn to do it well by allowing maximum flexibility and providing opportunity to learn from experience.

5. Situations differ in academic units whose administrators are to be evaluated and therefore details of procedure are best left to be determined by the evaluating committees.

I. General Provisions

1. All academic administrators shall be evaluated two years after initial appointment and at least once every five years thereafter.

2. Academic administrators shall be evaluated in terms of their job descriptions as supplemented by their immediate administrative superior.

3. Evaluating Committees shall be free to consult any sources they deem relevant in assessing the performance of the administrator being evaluated. Evaluating Committees shall develop means for all members of the relevant faculty units to participate in the evaluation.

4. All materials and communications gathered or received by the evaluating committees shall be kept in confidence. Communications to the committees shall be kept by them until the completion of the evaluation process and then be destroyed.

5. Evaluating committees shall prepare written reports including recommendations pertaining to the improvement of the effective functioning of the administrative position. A copy shall be given to the administrator evaluated.

6. The term "faculty" in this report refers to members of the "Faculty at large."
II. Specific Provisions

A. Evaluation of Department Chairpersons

1. The Dean of the College shall initiate the evaluation process by calling for the election of a Departmental Chairperson Evaluation Committee. The size of the Committee shall be determined by the faculty of the department but shall consist of at least three members of the department. The Dean of the College shall convene the Committee, appoint its chairperson and in consultation with the Committee establish deadlines.

2. In addition to the criteria set forth in part two of the General provisions, the Chairperson shall be evaluated on at least the following criteria: Departmental management and administration, Curriculum development and Improvement of instruction, Faculty development, Departmental representation, Interpersonal relations, Short and long range planning.

3. The teaching of the Chairperson shall be evaluated in the regular course of evaluation of teaching of tenured or untenured faculty.

4. The Committee shall request all departmental chairpersons in the University to present their assessment of the Chairperson to the Committee.

5. The Committee shall present its report to the Dean with a copy to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

6. Extraordinary evaluation of a Department Chairperson shall be initiated by the Dean of his College upon written request of a majority of the departmental faculty.

B. Evaluation of Deans and Associate Deans of Academic Colleges

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall initiate the evaluation process by calling for the election of a College Evaluation Committee. The faculty of each department in the College shall elect one of their members to serve on the Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall convene the Committee, appoint its chairperson, and in consultation with the Committee establish deadlines.

2. The Committee shall present its report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with copies to the President and when evaluating the Associate Dean to the Dean.

3. Extraordinary evaluation of a Dean or Associate Dean shall be initiated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on receipt of a written request from twenty five per cent of the faculty of the College.
C. Evaluations of Dean of the Graduate School

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall initiate the evaluation by calling for the election of a Committee for the Evaluation of the Graduate Dean. The graduate and associate graduate faculty in each College shall elect by clear majority one of their members from nominees named by the graduate and associate graduate faculty of each department in the College to serve on the Committee. If no clear majority is achieved on the first ballot a run off election shall be conducted between the two candidates with the largest number of votes. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall convene the Committee, appoint its chairperson and in consultation with the committee establish deadlines.

2. The Committee shall present its report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. Extraordinary evaluation of the Dean of the Graduate School shall be initiated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on written request by twenty five per cent of the graduate and associate graduate faculty of the University.

D. Evaluation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Dean of the Division of Continuing Education

1. The President shall initiate the evaluation process by calling for the election of a University Evaluation Committee. The faculty in each College shall elect by clear majority one of their members from nominees named by the faculty of each department in the college to serve on the Committee. If no candidate receives a clear majority on the first ballot a run off election shall be held between the two candidates with the largest number of votes. The President shall convene the Committee, appoint its chairperson and in consultation with the Committee establish deadlines.

2. The Committee shall present its report to the administrator's immediate superior.

3. Extraordinary evaluation of these administrators shall be initiated by the President on written request by ten per cent of the faculty of the University.