



Faculty Senate

East Carolina University
140 Rawl Annex • Greenville, NC 27858-4353
252-328-6537 office • 252-328-6122 fax
facultysenate@mail.ecu.edu
<http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/>

October 18, 2007

Chancellor Steve Ballard
East Carolina University
Spilman Building

Dear Dr. Ballard:

On October 9, 2007, the Faculty Senate adopted the following resolutions for your consideration.

- 07-21 Resolution on Proposed Changes to the UNC Code (attached).
- ✓ 07-23 Request for discontinuance of the Early Childhood Certificate Program in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations, College of Human Ecology, Request to offer existing MAEd in B-K Education Online and a Request for Authorization to Establish Doctor of Audiology (AuD) Program, in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Allied Health Sciences.
- ✓ 07-24 Report on Faculty Input in the Evaluation of Administrators, including the nine principles enumerated during the meeting and included in the final document (attached).

The Faculty Senate also acted on one additional issue that resulted in a resolution not requiring action by you at this time.

07-22 Revisions to the UNC Faculty Assembly Charter.

Thank you for your consideration of the above mentioned resolutions.

Sincerely,

Mark Taggart
Chair of the Faculty

copy via email

Faculty Officers
Marilyn Sheerer, Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Phyllis Horns, Interim Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences
Deirdre Mageean, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING

Faculty Senate Resolution #07-21

Approved by the Faculty Senate: October 9, 2007

Approved by the Chancellor: pending

Whereas, academic freedom and tenure are core values of the American academic system and thus are of significant concern to faculty; and

Whereas, the UNC system, as the oldest public university in the nation, has been and should continue to be a leader in best practices in academic; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has pointed out significant problems with key aspects of the revisions proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee" (as of July 17, 2007), particularly those relating to institutional guarantees of tenure, grounds for discharge, utilization of post tenure review for discharge, and rights of "special faculty"; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has noted that there are areas in which the language of the proposed changes needs to be clarified in order to avoid possible future confusion and has developed alternative language to address its concerns with the "Code 603/604 Committee" proposal; and

Whereas, it is the view of both the UNC Faculty Assembly and the ECU faculty that the Code Review Committee's work exceeded its charge insofar as it included recommendations regarding post-tenure review processes that are inconsistent with policies reviewed and supported by the Assembly in late Spring 2007, as reported to the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure in June 2007; and

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has sought additional review from faculty from the constituent UNC campuses.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the ECU faculty affirms its support for UNC Faculty Assembly's criticisms of the changes proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee" in its July 2007 draft.

Be It Further Resolved, that the ECU faculty requests that submittal of the "Code 603/604 Committee" recommendations be deferred so that appropriate Faculty Senate committees might have adequate time to evaluate both the implications of the proposed changes for the status of academic tenure and the implications for administrating such changes within the academic units at this institution and respectfully invites the administration of ECU to join us with the request.

Faculty Senate Resolution #07-24

Approved by the Faculty Senate: October 9, 2007

Approved by the Chancellor: pending

The Faculty Senate endorses the following principles on administrator evaluations and moves to have these principles transmitted, along with the latest draft of the instrument being proposed by the Faculty Governance Committee, to Chancellor Ballard and members of the Task Force on Administrator Evaluation.

- The Chancellor or his representatives is responsible for reviewing the administrative performance of the academic officers.
- The evaluation of administrators should be drawing on all informed sectors of the university community.
- The evaluation needs to be done periodically.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING (continued)

- The evaluation should be a collaborative endeavor involving the faculty, the administration and other campus constituencies.
- The evaluation must be constructive and developmental; its ultimate purpose should be to offer guidance on improving performance.
- There should be a commitment of all parties to a generally understood and agreed-upon procedure to carrying the review.
- According to the nature of the administrative post, there should be a distinction of the appropriate level of faculty involvement.
- The voice of the faculty is to be weightiest at the departmental and decanal level, and more diluted by the necessary presence of other institutional constituencies in the review of administrators above the level of dean.
- Faculty need to have reason to believe that their participation in the review has been meaningfully taken into consideration in the outcome.

Report on faculty input to the Chancellor and his/her representatives in the evaluation of 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 facilitate shared governance.

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

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

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING
(continued)**

- 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. Patient Care – Supports and fosters a climate that promotes an excellence in patient care.
- i. Service – Participates and encourages service activities related to the fulfillment of the University's mission.
- j. 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.
- k. 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.
- l. Assessment - Effectively evaluates or assesses the units under his/her administration, acknowledges areas of excellence, and recommends areas where improvement is needed.

3. 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.

4. Appointment of faculty representation to a Review Committee for Administrator Evaluations

The East Carolina University faculty believe that it is important for the review of academic administrators to 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/her 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.

To be eligible to serve on a 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 members of the Review Committee will be selected in the following way:

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING
(continued)**

- a. The Committee on Committees, in consultation with the reviewing officer, will provide a slate of candidates for the Review Committee.
- b. The Faculty Senate will elect 7 voting faculty members to the 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 and Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences and Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, seven faculty members of the Review Committee will be selected in the following way:

- a. The Committee on Committees, in consultation with the reviewing officer, will provide a slate of faculty candidates for each Review Committee representing the appropriate constituencies for the administrator being reviewed.
- b. The Faculty Senate will elect 4 voting faculty members to each Review Committee during the November Faculty Senate meeting.
- c. The Chancellor or his representative will appoint 3 members for each Review Committee.

For the review of Deans, Associate Deans, Directors of Academic Library Services and the Health Sciences Library, the faculty members of the Review Committee will be selected 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, appointed by the Chair of the Faculty in consultation with the constituency and the reviewing officer, 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.

For the review of Chairs and Directors of Professional Schools, Centers, and Institutes with academic programs, the faculty members of the Review Committee will be selected 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 Review Committee. Administrators should not be appointed to Review Committees when they are themselves undergoing review.

6. Procedures

The 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 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.

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING
(continued)**

- 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 to address confidentiality in information supplied to the committee and to allow for anonymous input to the committee.
 - 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 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 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 Review Committee will provide its report to the reviewing officer.

8. After the review

The reviewing officer shall review the Review Committee's report and inform the officer under review, the 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.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING
(continued)

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 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:

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 9, 2007, MEETING
(continued)**

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.