

**FINAL REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION
September 5, 2007**

The Faculty Senate suspended the Administrator Evaluation Processes outlined in Sections 5.76.10–5.76.12 & 10.90.10–10.90.15 of the University Manual for the 2006-07 academic year, during which the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Administrator Evaluation [James Miller, Laurie Lauzon Clabo, William Rosen (Chairman), Clifford Katz & Sheila Black Grubman] reviewed the existing Administrator Evaluation Process and developed and tested a less cumbersome and streamlined evaluation procedure that was tied to the Provost’s timeline for the review of administrators. During the summer the Ad Hoc Committee consulted with the President, the Provost and the Council of Deans. The Ad Hoc Committee now recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the following changes to the University Manual on Administrator Evaluation.

EXISTING MANUAL SECTIONS

5.76.10 Administrator Evaluation

Committees shall be established within each administrative unit to conduct administrator evaluations as described in sections 10.90.10-10.90.15.

5.76.11 Each administrator evaluation committee shall normally consist of 3-5 members. Three members shall be selected from a slate of nominees or volunteers generated from the administrator's constituent group (defined in section 5.76.12) by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The administrator shall have the option to choose an additional member of the committee. In addition, for all administrators except the President, the immediate supervisor shall also have the option to choose an additional member of the committee. The additional members of the committee shall usually come from the constituent group.

5.76.12 The constituent groups shall be defined as follows: a) all continuing members of the appropriate college faculty for academic deans with college faculties; b) all continuing faculty who are currently teaching, or who have taught at the Feinstein College of Continuing Education in the preceding three years and chairpersons of academic departments for the Vice Provost for Urban Programs; c) all continuing faculty who are currently teaching courses or who have served as advisors to University College during the three years immediately preceding the evaluation for the Dean of University College and Special Academic Programs; d) all continuing marine programs faculty as identified by the Vice Provost for the Vice Provost for Marine Programs; e) all continuing members of the general faculty for the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies, Research and Outreach; f) all continuing members of the general faculty for the Vice Provost for Information Services; g) all continuing members of the general faculty for the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; h) all continuing

PROPOSED MANUAL SECTIONS

NO CHANGE

5.76.11 Each administrator evaluation committee shall normally consist of **5 members except for the President’s, which shall have 4 members.** Three members shall be selected from a slate of nominees or volunteers generated from the administrator's constituent group (defined in section 5.76.12) by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The administrator **shall choose** an additional member of the committee. In addition, **the President or Provost as appropriate shall choose** an additional member of the committee. The additional members of the committee shall usually come from the constituent group.

5.76.12 The constituent groups shall be defined as follows: a) **for academic deans with college faculties:** all continuing members of the appropriate college faculty; b) **for the Vice Provost for Urban Programs:** all continuing faculty who are currently teaching, or who have taught at the Feinstein College of Continuing Education in the preceding three years and **academic department** chairpersons **who participate in programs at ASFCCE;** c) **for the Dean of University College and Special Academic Programs:** all continuing faculty who are currently **teaching URI 101** or who have served as advisors to University College during the three years immediately preceding the evaluation; d) **for the Dean of the Graduate School,** all continuing members of the graduate faculty; e) for the **President, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Research and Economic Development, and the Vice Provosts;** all continuing members of the general faculty.

members of the general faculty for the President.

EXISTING MANUAL SECTIONS

10.90.10 Faculty Evaluation of Administrators. The purpose of Administrator Evaluation is to help administrators do their jobs as well as possible in accordance with long-range plans and goals, by giving them, regularly and through established procedures, information about how their faculty perceive their current effectiveness and what things their faculty deem it most important that they do. In conducting this procedure the faculty acknowledges that this is only one element of an overall evaluation of administrators.

10.90.11 The President, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies, Research and Outreach, the Vice Provost for Marine Programs, the Vice Provost for Information Services, and all academic deans including the Deans of the University College and Special Academic Programs, the Feinstein College of Continuing Education, Graduate School of Oceanography, and of the Library are subject to faculty evaluation. An administrator must be in the position at least two years before an evaluation is conducted. After the first evaluation, the administrator will be subject to faculty evaluation once every five years.

PROPOSED MANUAL SECTIONS

NO CHANGE

10.90.11 The President, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the **Vice President for Research and Economic Development, the Vice Provosts,** and all academic deans including the Dean of the University College and Special Academic Programs, the Graduate School, the Graduate School of Oceanography, and of the Library are subject to faculty evaluation. **The evaluation will follow the President's or the Provost's review cycle beginning at the end of the second year of the administrator's first term. After the first evaluation, the administrator will be subject to faculty evaluation on a regular basis not to exceed five year cycles.**

NEW

10.90.12 Review Letters. The administrator evaluation process is based in part on peer reviews, which are a fundamental practice in academia. Therefore, objective and balanced evaluations are necessary for an effective procedure. Each member of an administrator's constituent group shall be invited to submit a one or two page evaluation letter to Administrator Evaluation Coordinator (see section 4.4 of the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate). For academic deans this letter should reflect the individual faculty member's judgment and evaluation of the administrator's performance in the following major areas of responsibility: 1) foster the education and learning of students of the college or unit and the University; 2) enhance the climate for research and scholarly activities by the faculty of the unit; 3) create and improve the outreach efforts and opportunities of the faculty and staff of the college or unit; 4) manage and balance the budgetary and fiduciary functions of the college or unit; 5) advocate for the college or unit within the administration of the University and the State in an effective manner; 6) and attract external funds in support of learning, scholarly activities and service/outreach. For other administrators, this letter should reflect the individual faculty member's judgment and evaluation of the administrator's performance in his/her major areas of responsibility. Writing an administrator evaluation letter is an optional activity.

Constituent review letters shall be submitted in signed envelopes. The evaluation letters can be signed or unsigned and will only be submitted to the appropriate Administrator Evaluation Committee for its use.

EXISTING MANUAL SECTIONS

10.90.12 Committees shall be established within each administrative unit to design, following general guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate, means for eliciting from the faculty in each unit their evaluations, and determine how the data are to be summarized and presented. See sections 5.76.10 - 5.76.13 for descriptions of Administrator Evaluation Committees.

10.90.13 Administrators being evaluated shall be consulted by their respective committees with regard to the process and instruments being designed in order that the administrator may provide input to the proposed procedure. In the unlikely event that consensus cannot be reached on the evaluation instrument and process, the differences would be referred to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for arbitration (see section 4.4 of the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate).

10.90.14 The written results of each evaluation shall be disseminated to the administrator involved, his or her immediate supervisor, and to the President by the evaluation committee for each administrator. The results of the President's evaluation go only to the President. The Administrator Evaluation Committee (AEC) performing each evaluation other than that of the President shall meet with the administrator involved, and may meet with the immediate supervisor to discuss the evaluation. The AEC performing the President's evaluation shall meet with the President to discuss the evaluation. All members of the constituent unit shall be notified in writing by the AEC as to when the meeting took place.

10.90.15 The respective administrator evaluation committees shall employ the following guidelines:

a. Before any evaluation instrument is designed, the committee should review the unit's mission and long range goals and formulate an accurate description of the functions expected to be performed by the administrator under evaluation. This formulation should be based on a formal job description submitted by the administrator to be evaluated and revisions suggested by his/her immediate supervisor and by academic department chairpersons who have regular dealings with that administrator (see section 5.76.12 for the definition of constituent groups). This procedure provides evaluative

PROPOSED MANUAL SECTIONS

10.90.13 Administrator Evaluation
Committees (see 5.76.10) shall be established within each administrative unit **to review faculty letters and determine how the letters and any additional** data are to be summarized and presented. See sections 5.76.10 - 5.76.12 for descriptions of Administrator Evaluation Committees.

DELETE

10.90.14 The written **summary of the evaluation** shall be disseminated to the administrator involved **and his or her** immediate supervisor by the evaluation committee for each administrator. The results of the President's evaluation go only to the President. The Administrator Evaluation Committee (AEC) performing each evaluation other than that of the President shall meet with the administrator involved, and may meet with the immediate supervisor to discuss the evaluation. The AEC performing the President's evaluation shall meet with the President to discuss the evaluation. **The administrator has the option to provide a written response to the Administrator Evaluation Committee.** All members of the constituent unit shall be notified in writing by the AEC as to when the meeting took place.

10.90.15 The respective administrator evaluation committees shall ensure the confidentiality of the process for the faculty participating in the process as well as for the administrator being evaluated.

information insofar as there are differences of opinion regarding the administrator's functions or the priorities to be assigned these functions.

b. From information derived by the procedure described in "a" above, the committee should establish a general description of the administrator's functions. That description should, in turn, be used as the basis for an instrument to elicit evaluative feedback from the administrator's constituent faculty.

c. In addition to requesting evaluation of an administrator's competencies in performing the job, questions should be posed about the administrator's style of relating to constituents, superiors, and others outside the unit. The committee's instrument might include (but would not be limited to) evaluations of such characteristics as effective management of resources, goal setting and achievement, communication, conflict resolution, leadership, and promotion of scholarship in light of the mission and goals of the unit.

d. The type of instrument devised shall be determined by the respective administrator evaluation committees. In all cases, individual faculty evaluators shall have the option of signing the submitted form or not.