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Annual Evaluation of Academic Administrators

Policy Statement

Regular evaluation of academic administrators is vital to ensuring ongoing improvement, development, and accountability. Eastern Kentucky University utilizes both annual and comprehensive evaluations in assessing the performance of academic administrators. The goal of annually reviewing administrators is to recognize exemplary performance, identify areas for potential growth, establish goals, and create professional development plans. The third-year comprehensive evaluation also includes participation and appraisal from all persons in a position to express valid viewpoints in the performance of individual administrators.

Evaluations shall provide the rational basis for decision making that considers the best interest of the academic mission of the University and shall result in a summary report that recognizes the necessity for transparency, accountability, fairness, and confidentiality.

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.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Academic Administrators
- Faculty
- Staff

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 the immediate supervisor of the evaluatee approves them 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 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.

Criteria

The following broad criteria shall guide the evaluation of administrator performance in all reviews: leadership, communication, administration, development, and relationships. Areas for consideration within each category may include, but are not limited to,

A. Leadership
   1. Creates a climate in which faculty and staff are encouraged to develop and continuously learn.
   2. Holds self accountable and ensures accountability in others for achieving results.
   3. Ensures that others have the resources, information, authority, and support needed to achieve strategic objectives.
   4. Effectively advocates for the needs of the unit.
   5. Reflects an ability to cope with conflicting requirements of multiple constituencies.
   6. Has a long-range vision, thinks and plans beyond year-to-year operation.

B. Communication
   1. Articulates a clear vision for the unit.
   2. Fosters an environment of open, honest, and respectful discussion of all issues.
   3. Creates an environment that ensures others have appropriate access to information which may be useful to them.
   4. Listens attentively and with empathy to concerns expressed by others.
   5. Communicates effectively to internal and external audiences by tailoring message, style, and content.

C. Administration
   1. Displays an ability to plan, organize, establish priorities, and make decisions.
   2. Effectively identifies, attracts, and hires faculty/staff.
   3. Allocates resources prudently and fairly.
   4. Objectively and fairly evaluates faculty/staff.
   5. Involves appropriate persons in decision-making processes.
   6. Handles conflict resolutions in fair and consistent manner.

D. Unit Development
   1. Facilitates opportunities for faculty research, other scholarly activity, and professional development.
   2. Creates and maintains an environment that supports the open exchange of ideas.
   3. Provides support for faculty and staff professional development.
   4. Scans the environment to plan strategic approaches and develop solutions for the unit.
   5. Encourages evidence-based decisions that are aligned with strategic priorities.
   6. Encourages staff and stakeholders in visioning process.

E. Relationships
   1. Treats others fairly and respectfully.
   2. Recognizes the feelings of others and exhibits an appropriate level of composure, patience, and diplomacy.
   3. Effectively cultivates and manages key constituent relationships.
   4. Connects people from across collegiate, cultural, institutional, and global boundaries to accomplish goals.
   5. Works towards achieving consensus among multiple stakeholders.
   6. Creates a positive image of the unit in the local and regional communities.

Procedures

The evaluation of academic administrators will consist of annual reviews over a three year recurring cycle of assessment. The focus in years one and two is narrow while the focus in year three is comprehensive. The primary purpose for reviews is developmental but reviews may be used for
retention or merit decisions. In unusual circumstances, a comprehensive review may occur in any year of the review cycle.

Academic administrators who shall be reviewed include:
1. Provost
2. Vice Provost
3. Associate/Assistant Vice President
4. Dean
5. Associate Deans
6. Department Chair or equivalent
7. Other academic administrators designated by the Provost. In making decisions regarding inclusion or exclusion, the following criteria shall apply:
   a. level and scope of institutional responsibility and impact; and/or
   b. unit size in terms of budget and/or personnel.

Year One and Two Reviews
1. During the spring semester, but no later than April 1, supervisors shall hold a conference with the academic administrator(s) who report directly to them. At this or subsequent spring conferences, the supervisor and the academic administrator will discuss the administrator's achievements with specific reference to the goals set in the previous conference. This conference will include a brief written summary of the administrator's goals for the next year as well as progress toward or achievement of the previous year's goals.
2. No later than December 15, the affected unit, by a majority of the full-time faculty in the unit, shall vote to determine if a comprehensive review shall be initiated in lieu of a narrow review. A supervisor may initiate a comprehensive review at any time. However, a comprehensive review shall not be initiated during an administrator's first year.
3. At the conclusion of all conferences, the supervisor shall send to all individuals in the affected unit notification of completion of the review and any actions that resulted from the review.

Year Three Review
1. For the Year Three Review, academic administrators will prepare a brief assessment of their work during the previous three years. The assessment must address, but is not limited to, the criteria for evaluation set forth in this policy.
2. During the spring semester, but no later than February 15, an evaluation survey adopted by the University and consistent with the criteria for evaluation of academic administrators, shall be sent to all persons in a position to express valid viewpoints of the academic administrators' performance. Such persons may include, but are not limited to, direct reports, faculty, staff, peers, students, and others external to the University. The evaluation survey shall be created by the Office of Institutional Research and approved by the Provost.
3. Each Department or College may choose to establish a Review Committee. The decision to establish a committee and the membership of the committee shall be determined by majority vote of the department faculty no later than September 30 in the year it is to function.
4. The review committee is responsible for compiling and summarizing the results of the evaluation survey, and will submit the summary to the administrator's supervisor no later than March 15.
5. No later than April 15, the supervisor will hold a conference with the administrator to discuss the self-assessment, the review committee's report, and other matters relevant to the administrator's performance. The administrator may append a statement to the evaluation. The supervisor and the administrator shall agree upon a plan for continuous improvement.
6. At the conclusion of the conference, but no later than May 15, the supervisor shall send to all individuals in the affected unit a notice of completion of the review and any actions that resulted from the review.

If the administrator is being evaluated as a non-tenured faculty member, the review committee and the Non-Tenure Evaluation Committee shall be the same; if the administrator is being evaluated for promotion or tenure, the review committee shall be the Promotion and Tenure Committee; and if a comprehensive evaluation is being held during the same year as a non-tenure evaluation, or a tenure or promotion application, the evaluations shall be done concurrently.

Administrative Review of the President by the Faculty
The President shall be reviewed by the faculty as part of the review process by the Board of Regents or the President of the University, and every four years thereafter. The Board of Regents or the President of the University may request more frequent reviews. The process for such a faculty review shall be:

1. All faculty who are members of the faculty-at-large as designated in “organization of the faculty at Eastern Kentucky University” shall be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The completed questionnaires shall be transmitted to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

2. Members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will be responsible for the tabulation of the responses and the transcription of comments. A summary will be transmitted to the President and to the Board of Regents. The individual review forms will be confidential and will be destroyed.

3. The questionnaire used to review the President shall solicit responses in the areas of leadership, management, communication, personal relations, fairness and overall evaluation. Opportunity should be given to provide open-ended comments as well as more quantitative review.

Signature on the actual questionnaire should be optional; however, signature on response envelopes may be necessary to ensure faculty status of respondents. Procedures for the distribution of the questionnaires and verification of respondents should be the same as those used for the election of the Faculty Regent.

### Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Administrator</th>
<th>The Academic Administrator is responsible for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• knowing and adhering to Policy 4.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• working with the Supervisor to create goals and development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• implementing each plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• writing a reflection for the Year Three Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Institutional Research</th>
<th>The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for creating the evaluation survey consistent with the criteria for academic administrators.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of the Provost</th>
<th>The Office of the Provost is responsible for approving the evaluation survey for academic administrators.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Committee</th>
<th>The Review Committee is responsible for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• analyzing the results of the evaluation survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• preparing a performance report to be submitted to the administrator’s supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>At a minimum, the Supervisor is responsible for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• conducting annual reviews of academic administrators who report directly to him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• working with academic administrators to create goals and development plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Administrative Evaluation of Department Chairs

1. 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 of 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 evaluation.

2. 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.

3. Each academic department that so chooses shall establish a Chair Evaluation Committee. The membership of this committee shall be determined by majority vote of the department faculty. However,

   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.
4. 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.

5. The duties of the Chair Evaluation Committee shall be able 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 evaluations.)
   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.

6. 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.

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

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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

1. 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.

2. Academic support administrators who work directly with the Dean as well as the college faculty and college chairs will be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires shall be transmitted to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

3. 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.

4. Each college which so chooses shall establish a Dean Evaluation Committee. The membership of the 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 promotion or tenure, 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, the evaluations shall be done concurrently.

5. The Provost and 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.

6. The duties of the Dean Evaluation Committee shall be to:
   1. Develop and submit to the Provost and 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 evaluations.)
   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 Vice President for Academic Affairs.
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