

DRAFT- 9-14-07

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Proposed New Section to Appendix L. ECU Code

H. Faculty input to the Chancellor and his/her representatives in the evaluation administrators.

1. Introduction.

The East Carolina University community believes every university employee deserves regular evaluation of his or her performance of professional duties as they relate to a formal job description and the university's needs. This process should be honest, open, and forthright; including an acknowledgment of the employee's achievements, as well as an assessment of his or her ability to match the university's expectations, and a determination of areas needing improvement.

The evaluation of ECU's administrators is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, or his/her representatives. In the evaluation of the academic officers, the input of the faculty is of primary consideration, although input from a variety of other groups is also necessary and must be received. In the evaluation of the Chancellor, the views of constituencies other than the faculty are as important as those of the faculty.

The procedures described in this policy are designed to serve the following purposes:

- to enable the faculty to provide input to academic administrators charged by the Board of Trustees or the Chancellor to conduct administrator evaluations;
- to provide information to administrators for the purpose of self-evaluation and improvement of performance;
- to facilitate communication between faculty and administration by providing procedures that stimulate faculty members to express their views of administrative performance;
- to provide faculty input to the appropriate appointing officer concerning the performance of the academic administrators;
- to exercise faculty governance;
- to include administrators in a process of review analogous to that which faculty experience.

2. Criteria to be used by members of the faculty in providing input in the administrative evaluation process:

- a. Leadership - Promotes high standards in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service; communicates priorities, standards, and administrative procedures effectively; articulates a vision for the future; communicates ideas in a clear and timely fashion to faculty, staff, and other University administrators; demonstrates listening skills; provides

national and statewide visibility and recognition for the constituency; contributes to the leadership of the University and effectively advocates for all relevant constituencies.

b. Shared Governance – Supports the principles of shared governance; adheres to the policies of the *ECU Faculty Manual* and other established governance documents.

c. Planning - Works effectively with faculty and staff in identifying appropriate short-term and long-term goals, in setting priorities, and in focusing resources across all constituencies.

d. Administration and Management - Oversees the recruitment and appointment of highly qualified faculty and staff; provides support for the successful recruitment and retention of administrators, faculty and staff; manages the administrative office effectively; seeks input and accepts responsibility for decisions; provides for effective budget management; works effectively with other administrative officers; makes decisions in a timely fashion.

e. Diversity - Encourages diversity and implements mechanisms for attracting and retaining underrepresented groups; is responsive to cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity; demonstrates and encourages respect for all persons in the constituency and the University.

f. Teaching – Supports and fosters a climate that promotes excellence in teaching.

g. Research/Creative Activity – Supports and fosters a climate that promotes excellence in research/creative activities.

h. Service – Participates in service activities related to the fulfillment of the University's mission.

i. Development - Within the context of the administrative office, works to identify and pursue philanthropic support for the constituency; develops public and constituency support for the University.

j. Personnel Development - Supports and defends academic freedom; provides guidance, support and resources for faculty and staff development, particularly in promotion, tenure and evaluation; demonstrates equitable judgment and action.

k. Assessment - Effectively evaluates or assesses the units under his/her administration, acknowledges areas of excellence, and recommends areas where improvement is needed.

3. Faculty Involvement

The East Carolina University faculty believes that it is important that for the review of academic administrators be conducted so as to include as many as possible of the faculty constituencies with whom an administrator works. The involvement of faculty in substantive ways is critical to an effective evaluation.

Faculty involvement in the review of administrators shall be initiated by the administrator charged by the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, or his representatives to conduct the review (hereafter to be named the reviewing officer). The review of the Chancellor shall be initiated by the Board of Trustees. In September, the reviewing officer will notify the Chair of the Faculty to begin the faculty portion of the review process.

4. Timeframe

The reviewing officer shall inform the constituent faculty of the need for a Review committee at least 5 months prior to the faculty vote on the effectiveness of the administrator. The committee will present its final report to the reviewing officer before the vote occurs. In accordance with part F of Appendix L, the faculty vote on the effectiveness of the administrator shall occur by the end of March.

5. Selection of a Faculty-Review Committee to Provide Input in an Administrator Evaluation

To be eligible to serve on a Faculty-Review-Committee, a faculty member must meet the definition of voting faculty as noted above in Section A of this appendix.

For the evaluation of the Chancellor, the Faculty Review Committee will be formed in the following way:

- a. The Committee on Committees will provide a slate of candidates for the Faculty Review Committee.
- b. The Faculty Senate will elect 7 voting faculty members to the Faculty Review Committee during the November Faculty Senate meeting every fourth year concurrently with the Board of Trustees' evaluation schedule.

For the evaluation of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences and Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, each Faculty Review Committee of 7 members will be formed in the following way:

- a. The Committee on Committees will provide a slate of faculty candidates for each Faculty Review Committee representing the appropriate constituencies for the administrator being reviewed.
- b. The Faculty Senate will elect 4 voting faculty members to each Faculty Review Committee during the November Faculty Senate meeting.

c. The Chancellor or his representative will appoint 3 members for each Faculty Review Committee.

For the review of Deans, Directors of Academic Library Services and the Health Sciences Library, Chairs, and Directors of Professional Schools, Centers, and Institutes with academic programs, the reviewing officer will convene a Faculty Review Committee which will be formed in the following way:

- a. The officer will designate a committee of at least 3 persons and no more than 7.
- b. At least two-thirds of this committee will be voting faculty members belonging to the entire constituency of the office whose administrator is under review, elected by secret ballot by a majority of the voting faculty members of that constituency present, and voting at a meeting called for that purpose by the reviewing officer.
- c. The remainder of the committee (no more than one-third) will be chosen from other constituencies in a manner designated by the reviewing officer.

The reviewing officer may request that the officer under review suggest potential members of the Faculty Review Committee. Administrators should not be appointed to Faculty Review Committees when they are themselves undergoing review.

6. Procedures

The Faculty Review Committee is responsible for conducting its evaluation in accordance with the criteria established in Section 2. Criteria to be used by members of the faculty in providing input in the administrative evaluation process. The Faculty Review Committee is also responsible for the following procedural aspects of the review:

- a. Meet with the reviewing officer to whom it reports to receive advice regarding specific areas for review and persons to consult, and to determine a proper timeline for the review to assure that the faculty evaluation material is ready in time to be included in the entire evaluation document.
- b. Meet with the officer under review. At this time, the officer under review will submit the administrative performance portfolio (Attachment), and may also suggest additional persons to consult. There should be no bar to further oral or written communication after this meeting.
- c. The committee may gather other information as suggested by the reviewing officer, the officer under review or at its own discretion; including, if appropriate, reviews by professionals outside the constituency regarding the performance of the officer under review in representing the officer's unit externally.

d. The committee will determine a method of operation that allows maximum participation in a consistent way. The committee will submit that method to the entire constituent faculty as a public document. This document should:

- i. State clearly how the review information will be sought.
- ii. Specify the timeframe for written or oral evaluations of the performance of the officer under review by faculty.
- iii. Specify procedures and state whether anonymous information would be accepted and, if so, how confidentiality will be maintained.
- iv. Identify persons or groups with whom the committee wishes to speak.
- v. Indicate openness to meetings with reasonable time limits with any individual or group that seeks access.

7. Review Reporting

Before the final faculty report is given to the reviewing officer, a draft of the report will be given to the administrator under review. It is appropriate to invite the administrator under review for an informal discussion of the findings. He or she shall be invited to prepare a written response. If he or she should choose to do so then any such response should be included with the final written report. The Faculty Review Committee shall present a written report to the reviewing officer. For Deans, Directors of Academic Centers and Institutes, and unit code administrators, the final written report should be available to voting faculty, upon permission of the administrator under review, prior to the faculty's vote on administrator's effectiveness. The final written report shall be forwarded to the reviewing officer at the same time as the report of the results of the unit faculty's vote on the administrator's effectiveness.

The faculty report should:

- a. Describe the main premises governing the report.
- b. State clearly what information was used, and the sources of this information in assessing performance in relation to the standards of evaluation.
- c. Give fair treatment both to the strengths and the weaknesses of administrator.
- d. Clearly state whether:
 - i. The review is positive.
 - ii. The Faculty Review Committee has areas of concern, in which case recommendations for improvement should be provided.
 - iii. The review is negative.

The committee shall continue its work until it receives information on how the officer under review responds to constructive feedback and/or a final decision is made. After meeting with the officer under review the Faculty Review Committee will provide its report to the reviewing officer.

8. After the review

The reviewing officer shall review the Faculty Review Committee's report and inform the officer under review, the Faculty Review Committee and the faculty of the unit of his or her conclusions. A negative review shall constitute a recommendation from the committee that the administrator be removed. A decision to terminate an administrative officer's appointment ultimately rests with the Chancellor, although the recommendation is generally made by the appointing officer. If the administrative officer under review is the Chancellor, the decision to terminate shall be made by the Board of Trustees.

The reviewing officer will forward the report and his/her recommendation to the Chancellor.

The reviewing officer or Board of Trustees shall publish a summary of the review, including a statement of actions taken as a result of the review. The summary shall include the principles, procedures, and criteria used in the review, but shall exclude any legally confidential information. (For a list of specific information that is appropriate to disclose see NC General Statutes #126-23.

Attachment

The administrative portfolio is prepared by the officer under review and documents his or her performance during the review period.

The administrative portfolio for the Faculty Review Committee shall include the following documents and statements:

1. Documents

a. Cumulative Report for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Form (see Part XII. of the ECU Faculty Manual);

b. unit strategic planning progress reports during the review period;

c. annual reports for the unit during the review period;

d. administrator's annual report during the review period;

e. annual faculty evaluation survey results during the review period (if such surveys are conducted for the officer under review);

f. annual personnel evaluations by the supervisor of the officer under review performed during the review period.

2. Statements

The administrative portfolio shall include a reflective statement describing the officer-under-review's:

- a. administrative philosophy, strategies, and methodologies;
- b. attempted innovations and assessment of their effectiveness;
- c. a statement of objectives for the future of the administrative unit;
- d. a written summary statement prepared by the officer under review that documents his or her performance during the review period. The summary statement shall address the evaluation standards referenced in Section H.2. above.

Upon permission of the administrator under review, the above documents and statements shall be forwarded to the voting faculty a minimum of five working days prior to their vote. If permission is denied, an abridged administrative portfolio, which shall include at least the following documents and statements, will be forwarded to the voting faculty a minimum of five working days prior to their vote.

The abridged administrative portfolio for voting faculty review shall include at least the following documents and statements:

1. Documents

- a. Cumulative Report for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Form (see Part XII. of the ECU Faculty Manual);
- b. unit strategic planning progress reports during the review period;
- c. annual reports for the unit during the review period.

2. Statements

The administrative portfolio shall include a reflective statement describing the officer-under-review's:

- a. administrative philosophy, strategies, and methodologies;
- b. attempted innovations and assessment of their effectiveness;
- c. a statement of objectives for the future of the administrative unit;

d. a written summary statement prepared by the officer under review that documents his or her performance during the review period. The summary statement shall address the evaluation standards referenced in Section H.2. above.

~~(Once the new Section H has been approved by the Senate and the Chancellor, the original document (currently referenced in Appendix L, Section F. as a link entitled [Review of Administrative Officers at ECU](#) [see below] will be deleted from the appendix.)~~

~~REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS at EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY~~

~~1. Application~~

~~This policy shall apply to all code unit administrative and all other senior university administrative positions beginning August 1, 2002. These positions include, but are not limited to, the following:~~

- ~~• vice chancellors~~
- ~~• deans of the professional schools, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and the Office of Graduate Studies~~
 - ~~• directors of Academic Library Services, the Health Sciences Library, Continuing Studies, and the Chief Information Officer~~
 - ~~• department chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences and in the professional schools~~
 - ~~• and individuals heading other units which report directly to the Chancellor.~~

~~Vice chancellors and deans are requested to adopt this policy and procedures for other administrative officers in their unit not covered above such as associate and assistant vice chancellors, associate and assistant deans, and directors of major university offices. Vice chancellors and deans wishing to utilize a different evaluation approach for administrators other than those positions listed above should develop an evaluation protocol by May 1, 2002 for approval by the Chancellor. All protocols should be reviewed and commented on by appropriate supervisors prior to submission to the Chancellor.~~

~~2. Review Period*~~

~~This review shall occur during March of the fourth year of the administrator's service and during March of every fourth year thereafter. In the case of code unit administrators, the unit faculty's vote on the effectiveness of the administrator shall occur during the same semester.~~

~~3. Review Authority~~

~~This review shall be initiated by the next higher administrator (hereafter called the reviewing officer). The reviewing officer shall appoint three persons to a Review~~

~~Committee, including one faculty member (or staff member, if appropriate) from the unit of the administrator undergoing review (hereafter called the officer under review), one administrative officer from a different unit, and one other administrative officer or faculty/staff member. The reviewing officer may request that the officer under review suggest potential members of the Review Committee. The Review Committee shall elect a Committee chair.~~

~~The reviewing officer shall meet with the Review Committee to advise the committee regarding specific areas for review and persons to consult. The administrator undergoing review may suggest topics or aspects related to his/her record or administrative style for special consideration by the Review Committee.~~

~~4. Review Methods~~

~~The Review Committee shall examine the following documents:~~

- ~~a. a. an administrative portfolio prepared by the officer under review that documents his or her performance during the review period;~~
- ~~b. b. administrator's and unit annual reports during the review period;~~
- ~~c. c. unit strategic planning progress reports during the review period~~
- ~~d. d. annual faculty evaluation survey results during the review period (if such surveys are conducted for the officer under review); and~~
- ~~e. e. annual personnel evaluations by the supervisor of the officer under review performed during the review period.~~

~~The administrative portfolio shall include a reflective statement describing the officer under review's 1) administrative philosophy, strategies, and methodologies; 2) attempted innovations and assessment of their effectiveness; and 3) a statement of objectives for the future of the administrative unit.~~

~~In code units, documents a., b. and c. shall also be provided to the voting faculty of the unit before the faculty vote on the effectiveness of the administrator.~~

~~The Review Committee shall make a general request for written or oral evaluations of the performance of the officer under review from administrators, faculty, staff, and students. It may also solicit specific feedback from selected individuals. The Committee may gather other information as suggested by the reviewing officer, or at its own discretion, including, if appropriate, reviews by professionals outside the university regarding the performance of the officer under review in representing the officer's unit externally.~~

~~5. Review Reporting~~

~~The Review Committee shall present a written report with recommendations to the reviewing officer. The written report shall be forwarded to the officer under~~

review and he or she invited to prepare a response, if desired. In the case of code unit administrators, this shall occur at the same time as the report of the results of the unit faculty's vote on the administrator's effectiveness. The reviewing officer shall review this information and report his or her conclusions to the officer under review, the Review Committee and the faculty of the unit. In the case of administrators of code units, the reviewing officer will forward his/her recommendation to the Chancellor.