



WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

December 21, 1982



Office of the Dean
Graduate College

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Donald W. Zacharias
President

FROM: Ed Dorman
James Flynn
Wayne Hoffman
Archie Laman
Reginald Laswell
William Lloyd
Larry Lowe
Virginia Neel
John O'Connor
James Rice
Patricia Taylor
Elmer Gray, Chair *E. Gray*

SUBJECT: Review and Evaluation of Academic Units/Administrators

In response to your memorandum dated December 6, 1982, the Committee has considered comments offered by the Faculty Senate.

1. Time interval between evaluations—The Committee maintained the five year time interval between evaluations. Since academic programs are evaluated on a five year cycle, the same cycle will permit administrators to be evaluated in conjunction with their respective programs. This time period is comparable to that adopted by many universities. The Committee maintained the five year time interval for department heads as well. Evaluation of department heads should follow procedures similar to those used for other academic administrators. Furthermore, department heads presently receive two annual evaluations—as teachers and as administrators.
2. Vote of confidence—The Committee was opposed to the inclusion of a vote of confidence as a part of the evaluation. The evaluation instruments were designed to assess the various leadership components, thereby presenting an administrative profile. Analysis of the ratings of individual leadership characteristics permits a more objective and constructive assessment. On the other hand, a vote of confidence is a more subjective, personal evaluation.
3. Anonymity of the evaluator—Section III B has been revised to reduce the likelihood of evaluator identification. Rather than including the original evaluation forms with their written comments, the numerical

December 21, 1982

data will be summarized statistically and all written comments will be transcribed. Also, the requested information on faculty rank and time distribution (Forms A and B) has been eliminated. For years of employment at Western, the categories have been reduced from five to two—further lessening any chance of identification.

4. Evaluation of the President—The Committee has never considered that its charge included the development of procedures for evaluating the President.
5. Evaluation of staff administrators—The Committee supported the position that assistant and associate deans and other staff administrators should be evaluated periodically as well as annually. The Committee's administrative evaluation procedures (Forms A and B) are directed toward line administrators, i.e., administrators responsible for academic program/units. The responsibilities of University staff administrators are diverse, precluding a common evaluation procedure. The Committee recommends that each line administrator develop evaluation procedures reflecting specific job responsibilities. Evaluation of those staff administrators whose functions involve faculty interaction should include assessment by that faculty. Staff administrators should be evaluated in conjunction with their respective line administrators.
6. Separate tabulation for different constituencies—The Committee opposed separate consideration of department heads' and faculties' evaluations of their respective dean. The evaluation criteria were developed for use by faculty members in evaluating administrators. The department heads participate as members of the faculty. Furthermore, for colleges having few departments, the question of anonymity could be problematic for those department heads.

The Committee's response to the Faculty Senate's comments resulted in some changes in the evaluation procedures. Attached is a copy of the revised document as approved by the Committee.

EG:dht

Attachment

cc: Dr. James L. Davis