

## APPENDIX B ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION: PROCESS AND PURPOSE

The committee studied the evolution of the Administrator Evaluation review process as well as its stated purpose, from the period before 2007 to the present. In the course of its study, the committee discerned three areas that require the deliberation of the Faculty Senate going forward.

1. The evolution of the process with respect to the means by which faculty perceptions are elicited and assessed
2. (a) The evolution of the process with respect to the stated of Administrator Evaluation as well as the role of the committee in designing the instrument.  
(b) The evolution of faculty advancement at URI with respect to which faculty are permitted to participate in Administrator Evaluation

### 1. EVOLUTION OF PROCESS: MEANS OF ELICITING FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

The University Manual passages governing faculty input clearly demonstrate the evolution of how faculty provide feedback on administrator performance, from non-specific options for offering “perceptions” via an “instrument devised” by an Administrator Evaluation Committee, to a provision soliciting “letters” submitted to an Administrator Evaluation Coordinator for use by an evaluation committee, to an “electronic survey” that allows anonymous, guided responses followed by opportunities for direct comment; data on responses as well as all comments are then provided to the appointed via the Coordinator.

Prior to 2007, Administrator Evaluations were undertaken within each College and other units by an appointed faculty committee, whose duties included establishing procedures for gathering faculty perceptions about an administrator’s performance. *Relevant passages are underlined by the committee.*

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.

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.

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 information insofar as there are differences of opinion regarding the administrator's functions or the priorities to be assigned these functions. 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. 54 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.

On 9-5-2007, New Manual processes specified faculty participation in reviews as occurring through the submission of letters, signed or unsigned, to the relevant Administrator Evaluation Coordinator for use by the Administrator Evaluation Committee. That committee was then charged with considering the letters as well as "any additional data" at its disposal.

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 ByLaws 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.

NEW 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.

On 4-17-14, the Faculty Senate adopted formal changes to the mechanism by which faculty input would be elicited following a period (2012-2013) during which pilot versions of an Administrator Evaluation electronic survey were utilized.

**10.90.12 Electronic Survey.** 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 review process. Each member of an administrator's constituent group shall be invited to participate through an electronic survey which will include an open-ended comment section allowing for submission of written comments. The AE Coordinator shall be responsible for overseeing and coordinating the entire evaluation process for all administrators. The AE Coordinator shall request and receive a copy of the administrator's job description, curriculum vita, and statement of accomplishments since her/his initial appointment or last review date. The documents provided by the administrators under review shall be distributed by the AE Coordinator to their constituencies. The survey responses shall be handled confidentially by the AE Coordinator. Participation in the review of administrators including the electronic survey is an optional activity. [#07-08-4](#), [#13-14-26](#)

The quantity and quality of faculty input changed dramatically following the changeover from unspecified instrument to letters to the electronic survey, generating much higher rates of response, more targeted and useful feedback, and more consistency of feedback with respect to performance criteria considered.

The committee concludes that the electronic survey is a superior instrument for eliciting faculty perceptions regarding the evaluation of administrators and recommends that it be retained as a method for faculty participation in administrator evaluations.

## 2. EVOLUTION OF PROCESS

### (a) PURPOSE OF ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

Perhaps as a result of an electronic survey instrument that gathered and presented faculty perceptions more efficiently and precisely, the stated purpose of the Administrator Evaluation appears to have migrated beyond the borders of its original intent. Prior to 2007, the University Manual clearly indicated faculty input as one dimension of a broader evaluation of administrators.

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.

This purpose was not altered during changes to the Administrator Evaluation Process introduced in 2007 (when letters were specified as the means of eliciting faculty perceptions), even though an Administrator Evaluation Coordinator had been introduced at that time (ByLaws 4-4 #07-08-8).

One initial aspect of the Coordinator role did alter slightly between 2007 and the present, with respect to the Administrator Evaluation Committees and the evaluation instrument. In 2007 the ByLaws stated:

4.4 The Executive Senate shall appoint an Administrator Evaluation Coordinator from the tenured faculty for a two-year term. The Administrator Evaluation Coordinator shall be responsible for the following: designating which administrators are to be evaluated in a given year; facilitating the election/selection of administrator evaluation committees within each administrator's constituent group as defined in section 5.76.12 of the UNIVERSITY MANUAL; providing guidance and suggestions to these administrator evaluation committees as they design their instruments and outline their procedures; and, monitoring the committees' progress in conducting the evaluations. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall review and evaluate the process as outlined here and as it evolves in the respective Evaluation Committees after the first three-year round and at least every six years after that. The results of the review shall be reported to the Faculty Senate. Committee with the consent of the Faculty

Currently, this section of the ByLaws has eliminated the emphasis on design of the instrument by committees, reflecting the changeover from letters to an electronic survey instrument, and replacing it with the Coordinator's generalized role of providing guidance:

4.4 The Executive Committee of the Senate shall appoint an Administrator Evaluation Coordinator from the tenured faculty for a two-year term. The Administrator Evaluation Coordinator shall be responsible for the following: designating which administrators are to be evaluated in a given year; facilitating the election/selection of administrator evaluation committees within each administrator's constituent group as defined in section 5.76.12 of the University Manual; providing guidance and suggestions to these administrator evaluation committees; and, monitoring the committees' progress in conducting the evaluations. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall review and evaluate the process as outlined here and as it evolves in the respective Evaluation Committees after the first three-year round and at least every six years after that. [#07-08-8](#)

By 2014, however, significant alterations to the purpose of the process itself were formally introduced.

10.90.10 Faculty Evaluation of Administrators. The purpose of Administrator Evaluation is to conduct a thorough performance review of administrators, using a well-defined procedure as outlined in the University Manual. The performance review includes input obtained through use of an electronic survey completed by the administrator's constituency group. The electronic survey results are summarized, documented, and shared with the administrator and the administrator's supervisor. The review results provide administrators with critical feedback from their constituency to help them improve and excel in their positions and/or identify problem areas that must be addressed. The review results provide important information to the administrator's supervisor within the timeframe for a decision on the reappointment of the administrator and establishment of goals and objectives for the new contract period.

The committee observes that the stated purpose of the Administrator Evaluation has migrated between 2007 and the present, from one acknowledging faculty input as “only

one element of an overall evaluation of administrators”, to one in which “The purpose of Administrator Evaluation is to conduct a thorough performance review of administrators”.

Several processual changes to the Administrator Evaluation Process occurred within the 2007-2014 timeframe, including the changeover from letters of evaluation to an electronic survey, and the corresponding role of the Administrator Evaluation Coordinator with respect to survey guidance. The excellence of the electronic survey instrument as a means of assessing administrator performance may be a driver of changes to the stated purpose of the process.

Nonetheless, the committee observes a significant difference in the stated purpose of Administrator Evaluation between 2007 -2014 and the present, and in light of this gap **the committee recommends that the Faculty Senate examine the expansion of the Administrator Review process beyond its original purpose and determine whether future surveys ought to return to a function of gleaning faculty input exclusively (as a single part of a separate, more comprehensive review) or whether they ought to function more holistically as an instrument of comprehensive review (including but not limited to faculty input).**

### **(b) EVOLUTION OF FACULTY ADVANCMENT AT URI**

While current iterations of Administrator Evaluation extend beyond faculty perceptions to include designated “others” of relevance to a “thorough performance review”, they also, perhaps paradoxically, formally exclude the participation of non-tenure-track faculty from offering their perceptions as part of the process.

Prior to 2007, administrator evaluation appeared to have included a broader array of faculty participation than is currently permitted by the manual.<sup>1</sup>

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 members of the general faculty for the President. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> At present and in practice, surveys appear to have been distributed to many individuals beyond those designated as “tenure track faculty.” Some surveys even allow, though do not mandate, faculty to self-identify as “Assistant Professor,” “Lecturer,” etc. Thus, some survey processes may not in practice be in strict compliance with the University Manual with respect to participating faculty.

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. All members of the general faculty for the President.

While “continuing faculty” or “appropriate college faculty” had been broadly taken to indicate “tenure-track faculty,” there appears at that time to have been some discrepancy with respect to marine faculty in particular. In any case, tenure-track faculty were not explicitly specified with respect to the Administrator Evaluation in changes made to the University Manual on 9-5-2007, concerning an administrator’s “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

On 4-4-2014 this section of the University Manual changed slightly to reflect alterations to administrative units but also both to eliminate references to “general” faculty and to specify “graduate” faculty for the review of the Dean of the Graduate School.

The constituent groups shall be defined as, but not limited to, the following: 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 Alan Shawn Feinstein College of Continuing Education (ASFCCE) in the preceding five years and academic department chairpersons who participate in programs at ASFCCE; c) for the Dean of University College for Academic Success: all continuing faculty who are currently teaching URI 101 or who have served as advisors to University College during the five years immediately preceding the evaluation and all academic department chairpersons; 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 faculty. #07-08--4

In 2015, a Faculty Senate bill was introduced and passed, which changed “continuing faculty” to “tenure-track faculty” in anticipation of ambiguities in the emerging Academic Health Collaborative. Partially as a result of this bill, since February 2017 the University Manual specifies tenure track faculty explicitly as those allowed to participate in the Administrator Evaluation process.

**5.76.12** The constituent groups shall be defined as, but not limited to, the following: a) for academic deans with college faculties: all tenure-track college faculty; b) for the Dean of the Alan Shawn Feinstein College of Education and Professional Studies: all tenure-track faculty who are currently

teaching, or who have taught at the Alan Shawn Feinstein College of Education and Professional Studies (ASFCEPS) in the preceding five years and academic department chairpersons who participate in programs at ASFCEPS; c) for the Dean of University College for Academic Success: all tenure-track faculty who are currently teaching URI 101 or who have served as advisors to University College during the five years immediately preceding the evaluation and all academic department chairpersons; d) for the Dean of the Graduate School: all tenure-track graduate faculty; e) for the President, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Research and Economic Development, and all Vice Provosts: all tenure-track faculty. [#07-08-4](#) [#13-14-26](#) [#15-16-15D](#) [#16-15-21](#)

More generally, the University Manual currently defines “General” Faculty in the following manner.

**4.11.10** Membership in the University Faculty, also referred to as the General Faculty, shall be based on appointment by the President and on direct participation in or supervision of any of the following activities: teaching, librarianship, and research, within the University. The General Faculty shall consist of tenure-track professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors ([see 7.10.10](#)); the President, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Research and Economic Development, the Vice Provost(s), and the academic dean of each college or school and of the library. [#15-16-29](#)

While the committee is aware of past and current debates and referenda concerning Faculty Senate and voting privileges of non-tenure-track faculty, it wonders whether the Faculty Senate review “constituent groups” for each administration, given who currently participates in practice and/or who should participate given recent changes to the formal review and potential promotion of full time Lecturers at the University.

**7.11.11 Full-time non tenure-track teaching positions.** The three titles of full-time non tenure-track teaching positions include Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Teaching Professor. The Lecturer title is used to designate appointments of persons who are serving in a teaching capacity for a defined period of time.

There are two types of lecturers:

**Lecturer** is defined as a position in which an individual may be appointed to multiple one-year appointments. Lecturers may be eligible for the promotional process to Senior Lecturer. For more details, including, for example, degree requirements, annual review cycles, expectations and promotion information, see the *Agreement between the RI Council of Postsecondary Education and the URI Chapter of the AAUP*.

**Temporary Lecturer** is temporarily employed to cover courses for full-time faculty who are on sabbatical leaves, sick leaves, or in some cases in the interval between the allocation of a new faculty position and the subsequent appointment of the new faculty. Temporary lecturers shall not be eligible for the promotional process to Senior Lecturer or Teaching Professor. For more details, see the *Agreement between the RI Council of Postsecondary Education and the URI Chapter of the AAUP*.

**Senior Lecturer:** promotion to Senior Lecturer shall follow an evaluation/review of teaching effectiveness and student advising within the college at the end of the 4th year for promotion in the 5th year. The promotional procedure shall be evidence based. Appointments shall be based upon excellence in teaching and advising starting in the fifth (5th) year and shall be for periods of two years with possible reappointments of two (2) years duration. Those Senior Lecturers without a terminal degree after three 2-year reappointments may be granted renewable three year appointments. For more details, including, for example, degree requirements, annual review cycles, expectations and promotion information, see the *Agreement between the RI Council of Postsecondary Education and the URI Chapter of the AAUP*.

**Teaching Professor:** promotion to Teaching Professor shall require a terminal degree in the appropriate discipline and shall follow a comprehensive review in the 8th year with demonstrated excellence in teaching effectiveness and student advising. In the ninth (9th) year, a Senior Lecturer, who has shown excellence in teaching and advising, and has been on continuous appointments as a Lecturer and Senior Lecturer, may be recommended to the Provost by the Chair and/or Dean to become a Teaching Professor with an initial four (4) year contract and possible four (4) year reappointments. For more details, including, for example, annual review cycles, expectations and promotion information, see the *Agreement between the RI Council of Postsecondary Education and the URI Chapter of the AAUP.*

Lecturers shall be expected to participate in department service activities pertaining to their normal instructional responsibilities. Senior Lecturers and Teaching Professors are expected to perform college and university service. For more details on full-time, non-tenure-track teaching positions, see the *Agreement between the RI Council of Postsecondary Education and the URI Chapter of the AAUP.* [Administrative Report January 2017](#)

Lecturers who have been promoted to Senior Lecturer and then Teaching Professor, for example, have significant responsibilities beyond those of mere instruction. In addition, the very possibility of promotion depends upon peer review as well as review and recommendation by a Dean and the Provost.

Thus, if Administrator Evaluation is meant, in part, to give faculty a voice in the review of administrative personnel, then the absence of such faculty voices in Administrator Evaluation should perhaps be reconsidered.

**The committee recommends that the Faculty Senate consider which faculty constitute relevant “constituent groups” for each administrator. Currently, a formal specification of “tenure-track” faculty as those permitted to participate in Administrator Evaluation may not match who actually participates or who perhaps ought to participate in those evaluations.**