April 4, 2006

To: Faculty Council, c/o Jon Sticklen, Chair, Executive Committee, Academic Council

From: Task Force II (George Stockman and Grover Hudson, co-chairs)

Subject: Recommendations

Task Force #2 was charged to

• Review the existing literature on faculty evaluation of administrators…and current developmental activities at Michigan State University;

• Review existing administrator evaluation practices at Michigan State to assess their conformity to existing requirements and to determine where a faculty-led assessment program might provide a useful contribution;

• Recommend a system of administrator evaluation to be used by the faculty; and

• Recommend implementation procedures and, if necessary, recommend means for funding the implementation and ongoing administration of the evaluation system.

Task Force 2 herewith reports to Faculty Council providing its recommendations and supporting documents as appendices. We ask that

1. Faculty Council endorse our recommendations, and
2. refer these to Academic Senate for possible endorsement by that body.

We suggest the following language for motions of Faculty Council:

Be it resolved that Faculty Council endorse the recommendations of Faculty Voice Task Force #2 (Faculty Review of Administrators) to recommend a regular system of administrator evaluation to be used by the faculty, and

Be it further resolved that Faculty Council refer the recommendations of Task Force #2 to Academic Senate for possible endorsement by that body, and
Be it further resolved that those of the recommendations requiring enabling bylaw changes (at least section 1(b)) be held in abeyance and passed on to Faculty Voice Task Force #1, to enable Task Force #1 to develop a comprehensive and complete set of bylaw changes as one package.
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MSU Faculty Voice Task Force II

Grover Hudson & George Stockman Co-Chairpersons, Robert Banks, Carla Carleton, Stephen Lacy replaced by Shawn Nicholson, Jane Miller, Mark Schroder, Brandon Sethi, John Shelle

Preamble: There is a perceived need at MSU and elsewhere for a bottom-up process of review of administrators by their constituencies in order to provide feedback on their leadership and thus improve the functioning of the university. The 2005 Faculty Voice Committee recommended this and Faculty Council charged Task Force II to further consider and propose such as process. After study of procedures in existence at MSU and other universities, Task Force II presented a draft proposal for faculty consideration via Faculty Council, electronic feedback, and open meetings. This current proposal that follows flows from the input from many members of the MSU community. It is expected that results of the Administrator Review will be used as advisory input in the regular process for evaluation and reappointment of administrators. Supporting information is available on the MSU ANGEL Site under the group ‘Administrator Review’.

1. Responsibility for review

(a) The faculty, specialists, and librarians (hereafter abbreviated as “faculty”) shall be responsible for planning and managing the collection of input from respondents and for reporting the collected results. The collection process should be independent of biased interest in so far as is reasonably possible.

(b) An Administrator Review Committee (ARC) shall be established by Faculty Council to administer the review process. ARC shall have no more than seven members and shall be constituted by methods used to elect members of standing committees.

2. Frequency of review

Responses in the review/evaluation process should be collected in the final two weeks of January of every odd year beginning in 2007. The summary of results should be accessible to constituents by March 1.

3. Who is reviewed

The following administrators will be reviewed: department chairs, school directors, deans, Director of Libraries, Provost, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and President.
4. Respondents in the review

Evaluation is to be solicited from the following groups who are vested in MSU’s future, who have direct knowledge to render in the process, and who may be conveniently identified for the web-based collection process:

(a) tenure-system faculty and librarians,
(b) fixed-term faculty, and
(c) specialists.

A respondent giving feedback in a review must be under the administrator in the strict hierarchical sense – to review a Chair/Director, the department/school must be the primary home; to review a Dean, the college must be the primary home. All respondents may review the Director of Libraries, Provost, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and President.

5. Criteria and method for review

a. Current MSU procedures, refined over many searches with input from many advisory committees, already identify an exhaustive set of criteria. The Administrator Review Committee (ARC) will identify or compose a set of 5 to 15 criteria appropriate to each position and produce a bubble sheet questionnaire amenable to statistical summary. Moreover, ARC will request an activity report and/or vision statement from the administrator so that faculty may review the record of activities and achievements.

b. Provision will be made for free form input, but such input will be anonymously sent to the administrator and then deleted from the record.

c. The administrator under review may submit up to 5 questions: bubble answer or written and responses to these questions will only be reported to the administrator.

6. Privacy and availability of results

An uninterpreted set of 5 to 15 histograms (one for each question) of the collected responses will be the only reported results. Identification of the respondent will be deleted from the system as soon as the respondent is certified. Generally, there will be separate histograms for the three categories of respondents identified in 4 above. However, to preserve anonymity, any histogram with fewer than 10 responses will be merged with the next larger category for the administrative unit. (For example, if there were 4 specialists, 4 fixed term faculty and 10 tenure system faculty, then the two groups of 4 would be merged into a group of 8, which would be further merged with the group of 10 to form a single group of 18. Hence, for that unit, a single histogram would be reported.) The only presentation of results will be to eligible respondents, and only by login to a website using an MSU net ID. Only someone eligible to evaluate an administrator may access the histograms of responses for that administrator.
7. Procedures

   a. ARC will contract with an MSU unit or other experienced social science entity to prepare and administer the questionnaire so that integrity of the data is maintained as well as the privacy of both the administrators and faculty respondents.

   b. From each administrator being reviewed a statement will be requested reporting on the vision, activities, and achievements since the last review. The administrator may adjoin up to 5 questions to the questionnaire as in 5, above.

   c. Respondent input should be acquired via a secure web transaction during a period of two weeks. The website will contain links to the administrator’s statement.

   d. As soon as a respondent is certified, respondent identity will be deleted from the response and no record associating respondent with response will be kept.

   e. Anonymous individual responses will be saved for two years. Archives are saved as needed for audit of the integrity of the process.

   f. Those eligible to respond in a review may access the resulting histograms via login using an MSU netID up to 31 April after the review.

8. Sunsetting

   These administrator review procedures will remain in force only until 31 April 2015 unless actively extended by MSU faculty governance.

9. Estimated cost

   $10k is the estimated cost for the first year of operation, with $5k estimated every two years thereafter.

*End of document*
Current MSU Procedures

MSU has in place detailed guidelines for a 5-year review of Deans, Chairs, and Directors. Documentation of these procedures were provided by Robert Banks, Assistant Provost, who has responsibility for advising academic units when such reviews are due. Several documents clarify the meaning and significance of such reviews. These are filed under the ANGEL group AdministratorReview under MSU procedures.

1. Appendix A below outlines the current MSU review procedure for the positions of Dean, Chair, and Director.
2. Two examples are provided for review of a dean -- from Engineering and Social Sciences: in both cases there is (a) a letter defining the procedure as agreed upon between the Provost's Office and the College Advisory Committee, and (b) a questionnaire to be used to gather feedback from the college constituency. Actual reviews were done recently. The statement of achievements of the Dean of social Sciences from a recent review is also included.
3. There is a document containing criteria that can be used for reviewing MSU administrators in general.
4. Two examples from Engineering are provided for review of a Chair, (a) procedures and criteria for the 5-year review of a Chair and (b) procedures and criteria for the annual review of a Chair.
5. A memo from Robert banks containing the schedule of upcoming reviews required for the many MSU Deans, Chairs, and Directors.

State of current MSU administrator review procedures

MSU has much in place already in terms of both procedures and criteria for reviewing an administrator. These procedures have been exercised many times; the two recent reviews of Deans are just two examples.

Task Force II identifies the following problems with the current MSU procedures for reviewing administrators, some of which are remedied in the proposal for faculty review of administrators.

1. Important administrators, including the President and Provost are not reviewed at all by faculty.
2. The review period of 5 years is too long to provide feedback for improvement or showing of support and far too long for removing an administrator who is not performing. Annual or biannual review would be more appropriate, as it is for faculty and other MSU employees.
3. There is negligible reporting back to faculty or the MSU community concerning the performance of an administrator when reviewed. If an administrator and the administrator's superior are both performing badly in concert, there is no transparency, revelation, or recourse.
4. There is a perception that current MSU procedures are not carried out in a uniform manner. The process of reviewing chairs varies from college to college.
Appendix A.

Below is an overview of the "Norms" of the current Administrator Evaluation System. Note under section two of the Bylaws of Academic Governance, the College faculty and usually the CAC and provost negotiate a procedure. The flow chart covers the norm, but sometimes Colleges make modifications. The Academic Human Resource Department (AHRD) oversees the Dean’s Review Process. Chairperson evaluations are managed by the individual Colleges with oversight provided by AHRD.

Section 2 (2.1.4) of the Bylaws for Academic Governance provide a commitment of reviews for MSU Deans, Directors, and Chairpersons at intervals not to exceed five years.

2.1.4. Chairpersons, directors, and deans shall be subject to regular review at intervals not to exceed five years.
2.1.4.1. The College Advisory Council of each college shall have shared responsibility with the Provost to determine procedures for the review of deans.
2.1.4.2. At intervals of not to exceed five years the dean shall review the reappointment of a chairperson or school director.
2.1.4.3. A department or school faculty shall have shared responsibility with their dean on procedures for review of a chairperson or school director.

**Norms - Dean Review Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provost alerts Dean of review (reviews occur at intervals not to exceed five years)</th>
<th>Provost &amp; Asst Provost/Ast VP for Acad HR meet w/CAC</th>
<th>Dean prepares statement of future vision &amp; lists tenure accomplishments</th>
<th>Individual private meetings - Provost or predetermined designate with each CAC non-ex officio faculty &amp; student member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAC's undergrad &amp; grad student reps solicit opinions - undergrad/grad students and relevant student orgs</td>
<td>CAC solicits opinions - faculty/staff</td>
<td>Written anonymous questionnaire developed &amp; distributed to faculty, staff, retirees from past 5 years - Provost's office to provide summary</td>
<td>External support letters sought by Provost's Office - identified jointly by CAC &amp; Dean &amp; input provided by peer MSU Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual private meeting between Provost or predetermined designate with Chairpersons and Associate Deans of college</td>
<td>Provost shares findings with CAC</td>
<td>Provost conducts review with Dean</td>
<td>Provost meets with CAC to share conclusions reached based on review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAC= College Advisory Committee
Michigan State University, April 2006

Administrator Evaluation: Comparison of Practice at Three Universities

A brief survey of three representative universities comparable in size and nature to Michigan State University, prepared by Carla Carlson, Grover Hudson, and Mark Schroeder, a subcommittee of Task Force 2 on Administrator Review.

Abbreviations:
SUNY B - State University of New York at Binghampton
U of I - University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign College of Arts and Sciences.
UM - University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

1. Selection and Organization of Evaluation Committees

a. University level

SUNY B: Nine full-time faculty chosen from Faculty Senate by secret ballot; one representative from each school

UM: standing committee: Administrator Evaluation Committee (AEC)

b. College level

U of I: Elected from among and by the faculty with one representative from each electoral grouping (e.g. department). The committee chair is appointed by the Provost.

SUNY B: Elected from among college faculty by the college's Faculty Senate.

UM: none, evaluation is university-wide

c. Department level

U of I: Three to five elected from among and by the faculty. Chair is elected by faculty from a list of three candidates provided by the Dean.

SUNY B: Composed of full-time faculty; size and organization left to discretion of each department.

UM: none, evaluation is university-wide

2. Administrators Subject to Evaluation

U of I: Dean, directors of centers and programs, and department chairs.
Administrator Evaluation: Comparison, p. 2

SUNY B: Currently includes (but not limited to) Provost, President, Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and the Deans and Directors of academic units.

UM: President, provost, deans and dept. chairs

3. Evaluation Procedure

a. Forms of response

U of I: Committee invites written commentary, provides an opportunity for faculty to meet with the committee, and may seek input from individuals outside the relevant unit. A graduate student representative is included in departmental reviews. A written report is submitted to the administrator’s immediate superior.

SUNY B: The evaluation coordinating committee sends a questionnaire to "natural faculty constituency" of the administrator; it requests documentation from the administrator (vita, job description, and narrative self-evaluation); and may solicit any other relevant data. This information is shared with the faculty in a general evaluation, and with the departmental review committee in a college evaluation. Departmental review committees solicit input from faculty, organize a vote of the voting faculty, and draft a report, explicitly stating whether renewal is supported or rejected, or they abstain from a decision.

UM: The committee prepared a set of 'core' questions for all administrators plus 'topical questions' suitable for each unit-objective questions. Faculty respondents are also invited to submit 'text comments'. Responses are provided on a dedicated website.

b. Timetable

U of I: At least every fifth year. Dean may approve early evaluations for center and program directors, and department chairs.

SUNY B: Academic administrators evaluated at least once every four years, although the evaluation process can be initiated at an earlier time (by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee).


c. Report Distribution

U of I: "Supporting rationale" for the renewal decision will be communicated.

SUNY B: All evaluation reports remain confidential. All reports are compiled into a final report giving a summary of department evaluations, and a sum total of the faculty vote for and against renewal, where appropriate. Report is forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; any response by the administrator is also forwarded.
UM: Text comments are provided to the relevant administrator and are not retained. Faculty receive full report of responses to 'core' and 'topical' questions, which are also archived, and given various comparative and statistical interpretation.
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