

Review and Evaluation of Academic Units/Administrators

I. Introduction

The performance of each administrative unit in the Academic Affairs area and of its administrative officer will be reviewed annually and evaluated periodically. The purpose of these reviews and evaluations will be to measure the performance and ascertain the needs of the units, programs, and individuals involved. The administrative officer of the unit will be evaluated in terms of the unit and program(s) for which he/she is responsible—not in isolation from them, in relation to available resources and support, in relation to established University priorities, and in terms of the responsibilities of the position.

II. Annual Review

A regular annual review session with the administrative officer of each unit is scheduled by his/her immediate administrative supervisor. The submission of the annual budget request is an appropriate time for this annual review, which requires neither the formality nor the depth of study and analysis involved in the Periodic Evaluation. Instead, the Annual Review provides a critique of the successes and failures of the past year, the current status of the unit, the development of plans, and identification of needs for the future. The Review should provide the administrative supervisor with the additional information and insight needed for effectively representing the needs of the unit to the next level of institutional management—as well as providing the opportunity for communicating his/her own assessment of unit quality and individual performances, the identification of new goals and priorities, and suggestions for improvement.

III. Periodic Evaluation

A formal structured review and evaluation of each unit/administrator will be scheduled at five-year intervals. The initial cycle of reviews and evaluations will follow the existing schedule for academic program review. Administrators responsible for a single unit will be evaluated in conjunction with that unit. Administrators responsible for multiple units will be evaluated after all, or at least a majority, of the reviews have been completed. A review of any unit/administrator may be initiated at a time other than the regular period upon the request of a majority of the members of the unit, the administrative officer of the unit, an administrative officer responsible for the unit, or the president.

2

A. Program Evaluation Information

Program data and information will be made available to the Evaluation Committee. Such program information includes institutional research data, internal reviews, Council on Higher Education reports, and accreditation studies.

B. Administrative Evaluation Information

The administrative leadership of academic units other than the academic vice-presidency will be assessed by the unit's faculty members through the use of Evaluation Form A. The administrative leadership of the academic vice-president will be assessed by the University's faculty through the use of Evaluation Form B. The administrative evaluation information forms (A and B) will become confidential. They will be summarized statistically by appropriate University personnel. The summary and the individual evaluation forms will be made available to the Evaluation Committee. The statistical summary will become a part of the Committee's report. The individual evaluation forms (A and B) will then be placed in confidential storage. The administrator being evaluated may request access to his/her individual evaluation forms.

C. Evaluation Committee

Program and administrative evaluation information will be reviewed and evaluated by committees composed of elected faculty members and academic administrators, as well as professional representatives selected from comparable institutions (Form C). The Evaluation Committee will interview the administrator of the unit as well as his/her administrative supervisor. The Committee may request additional information from the unit and/or interviews with assistant/associate administrators.

D. Committee Report

At the conclusion of the review, the Evaluation Committee will make a written report including an evaluation of the current level of performance of the unit and its leadership and the progress of the unit during the period of review. The Committee will make other specific recommendations considered desirable. The Committee report will be given to the administrative supervisor, who will provide a copy for the administrator of the unit being reviewed. After his/her response to the administrative supervisor, copies of the report and the response will be given to the academic vice-president. Subsequently, the administrative supervisor will schedule a meeting with the



members of the unit to discuss the evaluation results. The evaluation results, other than Forms A and B, will be maintained in the office of the administrative supervisor and will be available to faculty members of the unit for reading but not for copying purposes.

4

PERIODIC REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

Administrator

Academic Unit

Evaluate the leadership of the administrator in the areas listed below. Use the scale -- 5=very good, 4=good, 3=average, 2=poor, 1=very poor, or NA=non-applicable. Should any area(s) appear inappropriate for the administrator or should your opportunity for observation seem inadequate for any area(s), use NA rather than a numerical rating.

Ratings (5, 4, 3, 2, 1, or NA)

- Leadership of the academic unit
- Management of budgetary resources
- Sensitivity to faculty interests and needs
- Encouragement of faculty growth and development
- Communication of criteria for advancement within the unit
- Recognition and rewarding of meritorious performance
- Promotion of quality in academic programs
- Presentation of a positive image of the academic unit within and outside the University
- Familiarity with current and projected trends affecting the academic unit
- Communication to unit members information pertinent to their professional development
- Interaction with the leadership of other educational units
- Fulfillment of the administrative responsibility of the position
- Consideration of diversity of viewpoints of unit members
- Awareness of educational needs of students
- Utilization of a fair system for personnel evaluation
- Initiation of program planning for the unit
- Use of personnel resources
- Support for the collective goals and objectives of the unit
- Relationship to the broader goals of the University
- Representation of unit members' concerns to higher administrative levels
- Enhancement of the scholarly role of the unit
- Development of rapport with public and private agencies relating to the unit
- Pursuit of external resources for the unit
- Administration of established guidelines
- Respect for the confidentiality of personal and private information
- Transmission of information from higher administrative levels to members of the unit

When evaluating college deans or the academic services dean, indicate your rank, years at Western, and your time distribution. When evaluating department heads, omit this information.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Years at Western</u>	<u>Time Distribution</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-3	<input type="checkbox"/> % Teaching
<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant professor	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-6	<input type="checkbox"/> % Research/creativ activity
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate professor	<input type="checkbox"/> 6-9	<input type="checkbox"/> % Public service
<input type="checkbox"/> Professor	<input type="checkbox"/> 9-12	<input type="checkbox"/> % Administrative
	<input type="checkbox"/> 12+	<input type="checkbox"/> % Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> 100%

Written comments may be made on back of page. Are you making additional comments?

Yes  No

PERIODIC REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENT

Evaluate the leadership of the academic vice-president in the areas listed below. Use the scale -- 5=verygood, 4=good, 3=average, 2=poor, 1=very poor, or NA=nonapplicable. Should any area(s) appear inappropriate for the academic vice-president or should your opportunity for observation seem inadequate for any area(s), use NA rather than a numerical rating.

Ratings (5, 4, 3, 2, 1, or NA)

- Administrative management
- Consistency of administrative philosophy
- Executive judgment
- Communication
- Delegation of responsibility and authority
- Promptness in written transmission of administrative decisions
- Impartiality
- Knowledge of issues and trends in higher education
- Decisiveness
- Commitment to academic excellence
- Responsiveness
- Sensitivity to faculty concerns and needs
- Availability/accessibility
- Involvement of faculty in decision making
- Consideration of diversity of viewpoints
- Maintenance and utilization of competent support staff
- Group leadership
- Planning ability
- Projection of positive image
- Faculty recruitment
- Rapport with external agencies
- Pursuit of academic program support
- Facilitation of grants acquisition

Indicate your rank, years at Western, and your time distribution.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Years at Western</u>	<u>Time Distribution</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-3	<input type="checkbox"/> % Teaching
<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant professor	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-6	<input type="checkbox"/> % Research/creative activity
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate professor	<input type="checkbox"/> 6-9	<input type="checkbox"/> % Public Service
<input type="checkbox"/> Professor	<input type="checkbox"/> 9-12	<input type="checkbox"/> % Administration
	<input type="checkbox"/> 12+	<input type="checkbox"/> % Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> 100%

Written comments may be made on the back of page. Are you making additional comments?

Yes  No



COMMITTEE COMPOSITIONS FORM C

COMPOSITION OF ACADEMIC UNIT/ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION COMMITTEES

I. Department Head

3 faculty representatives for departments with 20 or fewer faculty, 4 for departments with 21-30 faculty, and 5 for departments with more than 30 faculty. These representatives will be elected by faculty of the department. All faculty of that department will be invited to participate in the evaluation via completion of Evaluation Form A.

1 member, appointed by the department's dean, from another department within the University

1 department head from the academic area, from comparable institution, selected by the department's dean

(chairperson will be appointed by the department's dean)

II. Dean

3 faculty representatives elected by faculty of the unit. All of that unit's faculty will be invited to participate in the evaluation via completion of Evaluation Form A

2 department head representatives elected from and by department heads of the unit

1 dean from the academic area, from comparable institution, selected by the academic vice-president

(chairperson will be appointed by the academic vice-president)

III. Academic Vice-President

5 faculty representatives - one, elected by the respective faculty, from each of the four academic colleges plus one from academic services. All faculty of the University will be invited to participate in the evaluation via completion of Evaluation Form B

5 administrative representatives - two deans, elected by deans, 3 department heads, elected by department heads - resulting in one administrator from each of the four academic colleges plus one from academic services

1 academic vice-president, from comparable institution, selected by the president

(chairperson will be appointed by the president)