

From: **Hughlene Burton** <haburton@uncc.edu>
Date: Thu, Sep 17, 2020 at 2:48 PM
Subject: RE: 2020-2021 Faculty Council Agenda
To: Joel Avrin <jdavrin@uncc.edu>

Joel

FAPSC met on Wednesday and we approved the updates to the policy for Evaluation of Faculty Administrators. This policy change was a carryover from last year.

Hughlene Burton



UNC CHARLOTTE

Office of Academic Affairs

9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704.687.5717 www.uncc.edu

MEMO

Date: January 29, 2020

To: Dr. Joel Avrin
President, Faculty Council

From: Joan F. Lorden 
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Cc: Matt Wyse, Faculty Governance Assistant

Re: Evaluation of Academic Administrators

The UNC Charlotte Academic Policy and Procedure: Evaluation of Academic Administrators has been revised to comply with North Carolina state statute. Following consultation with the Office of Legal Affairs, the attached policy has been revised to instruct administrators to release their self-assessment, goals, and summary of accomplishments on their own behalf, rather than those materials being released by the supervisor.

I ask that FAPSC review and submit the policies to the Faculty Executive Committee and the Faculty Council for approval.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Attachment

UNC CHARLOTTE ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROCEDURE: EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

I. Introduction

A regular, ongoing evaluation of the performance of academic administrators is essential to improve administrative performance and assure accountability for the achievement of institutional goals. There are two elements in a successful evaluation procedure: formative and evaluative. The formative element involves a process of collecting information of current performance, analyzing this information, and providing feedback to the person being evaluated to improve current performance. The evaluative element is a much more comprehensive evaluation procedure carried out at much less frequent intervals. While it also involves the collection and analysis of information on performance, its perspective is broader than simply current performance, and its purpose is more judgmental--as to whether it is in the institution's best interests to continue with or replace that administrator.

II. Policy and Procedure Statement

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Following are guiding principles for the design of thorough, fair, and unbiased processes and procedures for evaluation of administrators:

- An evaluation process designed to improve the current performance of administrators requires a two-way, ongoing exchange of information. Broad input is required for a comprehensive review, including self-assessment, formation of representative committees, input from faculty, chairs, deans, and other administrators, and, at least for some administrators, relevant off-campus constituencies.
- The evaluation process provides sufficient flexibility to allow individual colleges or units to continue or develop their own procedures to review college or unit specific issues. However, such local procedures must be consistent with campus-wide guidelines.
- A performance review requires the development of a comprehensive job description. These job descriptions should be developed at the unit level (department for chairs, college for deans, and so on) where a clear and thorough job description does not already exist. These job descriptions must be consistent with campus-wide criteria that address expectations common to all academic administrators.
- The campus-wide criteria forming the underlying basis for all administrator job descriptions should include considerations of performance in the main areas of academic administration: leadership/vision/planning; faculty and staff allocation, recruitment, development, and retention; instructional, research and service

programs; student recruitment, advising and oversight; and budget/management. In addition, the campus-wide criteria should include attention to the performance of administrators in enhancing the presence of diverse groups and creating a positive climate in their unit for the development of faculty, staff, and students.

- As far as is possible, the review process is the responsibility of the members of the academic unit of the administrator under review.
- The annual review process is designed to assist the administrator in doing his/her job better and to determine the extent of merit raises. The collective results of these annual reviews will form an important component of the comprehensive evaluation procedure.
- The review process is designed primarily to evaluate the effectiveness of the administrator and to assist the administrator in doing his/her job better. However, while the recommendations emerging from the review process are advisory in nature, careful attention by the administrator's supervisor is given both to using these recommendations and to being seen to be using these recommendations in making decisions on the reappointment and/or professional development of the administrator.
- Deadline dates for collection of data, delivery of the data to the review committee, and designation of personnel to assemble the data are the responsibility of the official who appoints the Review Committee. Material provided to the review committee will include copies of the unit goals and planning documents.

EXPECTATIONS OF GOOD ADMINISTRATORS

The campus-wide guidelines, which will be part of the job descriptions, should also address appropriate and desirable "behaviors" expected of administrators. These could include (but are not limited to) the ability to listen, build consensus, establish priorities, address difficult issues, resolve conflicts, and maintain a high level of personal integrity. Also, the guidelines should pay specific attention to broad campus goals on the enhancement of diversity and the creation of a positive "climate" for faculty, staff, and students.

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Review Committee

Annual evaluations of Department Chairs, Assistant/Associate Deans, Deans, and the Provost are conducted by elected review committees. For Chairs, the appropriate review committee could be the elected Department Review Committee (DRC) or another duly elected committee. For Deans, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans, the appropriate elected review committee might be the College Review Committee (CRC), a college faculty executive committee (such as the Executive Committee of the College of Engineering Faculty Organization), or some other elected committee to be determined by each college or the Library. An appropriate review committee for the Provost could be the Faculty Academic Planning and Budget Committee and/or elected members of the Faculty Executive Committee.

Input

The annual review process is initiated when the administrator submits to the Review Committee (hereafter "the committee") and to the faculty a brief self-assessment, goals, and summary of accomplishments for the current academic year and goals for the upcoming year. The administrator should also report upon his/her teaching and professional activities. This summary should be provided to the committee on or before April 1. Administrators are also asked to provide a [statement waiving their right](#) to review individual faculty responses and comments received during the review process.

For Chairs, Assistant and Associate Deans, and Deans, the committee will distribute a copy of the administrator's self-assessment and summary of accomplishments to each voting member of the administrator's academic unit and to staff as deemed appropriate by the next highest administrator. For the Provost, the committee distributes a copy of the Provost's self-assessment and summary of accomplishments and goals to Deans, Chairs, and the Faculty Executive Committee.

Each year members of the faculty from the unit are invited to send comments on the administrator's performance to the committee. While the committee may simply ask for a general response, it could also guide these comments by asking for responses to questions such as "What did this administrator do well this year?" "What could this administrator do to improve his/her performance?" and "What other issues do you believe deserve the administrator's attention in the coming year?" The committee will guarantee the confidentiality of these faculty responses. The committee collects and analyzes these responses; however, in preparing its analysis of the administrator's performance, the committee is not limited solely to summarizing the evaluation responses. Regardless of the level of administrator, the committee should also utilize its independent judgment to prepare an evaluation report and make recommendations to improve the administrator's effectiveness or call his or her attention to issues of concern to the faculty.

Because surveying faculty can be a particularly laborious task at a busy time of year, it is recommended that reviewing committees decide when a more complete collection of faculty opinion is required to inform the annual review. In many cases, the committee members may decide that they know enough about faculty perceptions of an administrator's performance to forego a survey in any given year. However, the faculty should be formally asked for their input at least every three years. In the case of Department Chairs, this would correspond to the normal cycle for the consideration of reappointment and the more extensive evaluation process involved at that time. In the case of Deans and the Provost, the solicitation of faculty opinion in the third annual review would mark the midpoint between appointment and the five-year comprehensive review.

Analysis and Reporting

The Committee is responsible for preparing an evaluation report to be submitted to the administrator and his or her supervisor. After discussing the committee's report with the administrator, the supervising administrator prepares a summary of both the

committee's report and the actions mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the supervisor with respect to the recommendations made by the committee. This summary is provided to the administrator who may then revise their goal for the upcoming year as appropriate. The administrator then disseminates their self-assessment, goals, and summary of accomplishments for the current academic year as well as their goals for the upcoming year (revised, if applicable) to the faculty of their unit (or, in the case of the Provost, to all faculty). This dissemination is required and all materials must be accurate depictions of those submitted to the supervisor. This summary is disseminated to the faculty of the administrator's unit (or, in the case of the Provost, to all faculty) at the beginning of the following academic year.

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

Interval for Comprehensive Review

The comprehensive review is generally conducted in conjunction with development of the reappointment decision for that administrator. In that most chairs are appointed for a three-year term, the review will be triennial. For those few chairs on a five-year term, the review will be quinquennial. If a chair does not want to seek reappointment, or if a dean or the Provost will not consider reappointment, there is no need to do the review. For assistant and associate deans, deans, and the Provost, the appropriate interval between reviews should not exceed five years.

Review Committees

Chairs, Assistant and Associate Deans. The dean, after consultation with the DRC and the chair, selects a 5-7 person Review Committee. This committee should be broadly representative of the interests of the department. As a minimum, one person is an elected member of the departmental review committee, one will be a current administrator from outside the department, and one member will be from outside the college in which the department is located. Optionally, one member can be from an interested group outside the University such as a departmental advisory committee or professional organization with ties to the department. The committee is established before the end of the academic year prior to the comprehensive review of the chair and elects its own chairperson.

Deans. The Provost, after consultation with the CRC/LRC and the Dean, selects up to seven persons to form a Review Committee. This committee should be broadly representative of the interests of the college/library. As a minimum, one member of the committee will be selected from faculty elected to the college/library review or advisory committees, one from administrators outside the college/library such as another dean, and one from outside the University. The committee is established before the end of the academic year prior to the comprehensive review of the Dean.

The Provost. The Chancellor, after consultation with the Faculty Executive Committee, the deans, and the Provost, selects up to seven persons to form a Provost Review Committee. This committee should be broadly representative of the interests of all academic units. As a minimum, one member of the committee will be selected from a

University division outside of Academic Affairs, and one member chosen from among the academic deans, one elected faculty member chosen from the Faculty Executive Committee or an ex-president of the faculty, and one member chosen from outside the University. The committee is established before the end of the academic year prior to the comprehensive review of the Provost.

Input

1. Before the end of the academic year prior to the review year, the Review committee (hereafter the Review Committee) meets with the administrator to jointly review the evaluation process, to decide on an appropriate timetable for the submission of a self-evaluation document from the administrator, and to establish a list of individuals (both internal and external to the unit) who have had an opportunity to work with the administrator and who are in a position to comment knowledgeably upon his/her performance.

For Chairs, this list of individuals to be contacted for input should include (but is not limited to): the full-time faculty (and staff) of the department; other administrators of the college; the departmental advisory (or visiting) committee (if any); alumni groups; community representatives (if appropriate); and students (individuals and groups, if any). In those units with significant numbers of part-time and non-tenure track faculty, feedback from these individuals should also be sought. For Assistant and Associate Deans, Deans, and the Provost, the list of individuals to be contacted for input should be appropriately broader, including department chairs, other senior administrators, student and alumni leaders, and community representatives as appropriate.

2. During the fall semester of the review year the Review Committee solicits evaluations for the administrator's performance and effectiveness from appropriate interested parties. The individuals contacted will include, but are not limited to, those persons identified in part (i) above.
3. The Review Committee, in soliciting both written and oral input from these individuals, will assure confidentiality so that individual comments are not identified in the review.
4. The Review Committee will use any other appropriate information in making its evaluation of the administrator's performance. At a minimum, this information will include the administrator's job description, the administrator's self-evaluation, and the results of the annual evaluations of the administrator (if any).
5. Deadline dates for collection of data, delivery of the data to the review committee, and designation of personnel to assemble the data are the responsibility of the official who appoints the Review Committee.

Analysis and Reporting

1. The task of the Review Committee is to address the effectiveness and the methods of the administrator in performing his/her job. Effectiveness is to be principally judged on the basis of the administrator's job description, and the progress made by the administrator's unit toward meeting articulated academic and institutional goals.
2. The Review Committee submits its evaluation report to both the administrator and the administrator's supervisor prior to the end of the fall semester of the review year.
3. The administrator under review shall have the opportunity to correct any errors of fact or omission in this report by corresponding directly with his/her supervisor.
4. After discussing the committee's report with the administrator, the supervising administrator prepares a summary of both the committee's report and the actions mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the supervisor with respect to the recommendations by the committee. ~~This~~ The administrator disseminates this summary ~~is disseminated~~ to the faculty of their ~~administrator's~~ unit (in the case of the Provost, to all faculty) on or before March-September 1 of the ~~review year~~ following academic year.
5. In Chair instances, comprehensive reviews inform the Chair reappointment process. Therefore, the report of the Review Committee and the recommendation of the Dean should be submitted to the office of Academic Budget and Personnel for the Provost's review and approval.