

Senate-Chancellor
Evaluation of Administrators

Manual

Revised Fall, 1998

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction and Purpose	3
II.	Guidelines for	
	A. Administrator Under Review	4
	1. Supervisor of Administrator Under Review	5
	2. Questionnaires	6
	B. Review Committee	8
	C. Chair of the Review Committee	12
	1. Final Report	14
	2. Plan of Action	15
	D. Standing Committee	16
III.	Directory and Timetable	
	A. Standing Committee Directory	17
	B. Administrative Review Timetable	18
IV.	Glossary of Key Terms and Individuals	19
V.	Frequently Asked Questions	20

I. Introduction

The Senate-Chancellor Evaluation of Administrators (SCEOA) Manual was developed to help participants move easily through the administrative review process. Examples of self-studies, questionnaires and various reports are provided in the Appendix. The manual does not attempt to answer every question that might arise. A member of the Standing Committee has been appointed to each Review Committee to answer questions and to serve as an advisor. Throughout this manual, the SCEOA process is referred to as the administrative review.

This manual was prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, (OIRA), in consultation with the Standing Committee, Office of the Chancellor, and the UT legal counsel. OIRA welcomes your thoughts and comments about the manual and how it may be improved.

Purpose of the Administrative Review Process

The purpose of the five-year administrative review is to improve the professional development process for both academic and non-academic administrators. The review will be held in the administrator's tenth semester of employment (excluding Summer Semester) and every five years thereafter. The administrative review is to complement the routine annual reviews carried out by each administrator's direct supervisor. The Primary objective is to conduct an in-depth review that will significantly contribute to the supervisor's decision to retain in the position or not retain the administrator. An additional goal is to develop those administrators who are retained. It is recognized that all individuals are capable of improvement regardless of how well they perform their duties.

Note: The text of the manual was taken from five documents: *Report of Senate-Chancellor Committee to Implement a Program of Review of Administrators*, August 31, 1992; *Standing Committee's Critical Review of the Review Process*, March 14, 1994; the transcription of an administrative review training session, February 7, 1995; *Ad Hoc Committee to Review SCEOA Process*, February 27, 1995; and *Recommendations from the Chancellor and the Faculty Senate Regarding the Evaluation of Administrators*, April 17, 1995.

II. Guidelines

A. Administrator Under Review

The Administrative Review process is a two-semester process that includes a planning semester and the actual review semester; for example, Spring Semester could be the planning semester and Fall Semester could be the review semester. Likewise, Fall Semester could be the planning semester and Spring Semester could be the review semester. Summer Semester is excluded from the review process due to the fact that many faculty are away during the summer.

All reviews begin with the preparation of a self-study by the administrator being reviewed. Please refer to page 26 in the Appendix for an example of a self-study by an academic administrator. An example of a self-study by a non-academic administrator can be found on page 38 of the Appendix.

An updated vita should be attached as an appendix to the self-study. Administrators also are urged to draw up a preliminary list of constituencies to be surveyed.

Before proceeding, please review the Administrative Review Timetable. It is very important that you, your supervisor and the Review Committee adhere to the timetable.

Planning Semester Tasks

1. Prepare a self-study (10 pages maximum) which deals with the following specifically and separately:
 - a. What are the major areas of responsibility?
 - b. How is the unit organized to carry out the major areas of responsibility?
 - c. Describe your management style. How do you reach decisions concerning the allocation of fiscal and personnel resources within the unit?
 - d. What role does the faculty plan in the governance of the unit?
 - e. Describe how you interact with the various constituencies of the unit within the University, in the academic world, in the community, nationally, and internationally.
 - f. Describe how you continue your academic and professional development despite the demands of your administrative responsibilities.
 - g. Attach a current vita to the document and submit the document to your Review Committee and to Cindy Lee, senior secretary for the Office of the Chancellor, P260 Andy Holt Tower, phone 974-2247.

Additional notes about the self-study

Non-academic administrators may not find all of the preceding outline pertinent or relevant; in some cases, substitution of “staff” for “faculty” is appropriate. Please review the self-study of a non-academic administrator on page 38 of the Appendix. The self-study should contain what the job is about, responsibilities, problems incurred when interacting with certain groups/administrators; existing problems, roadblocks to progress, achievement and future goals. This is your opportunity to say what you need to say about your position.

2. After submitting your self-study, meet with your supervisor and Review Committee to:
 - a. finalize a list of constituencies to be surveyed;
 - b. revise the generic survey as needed (change questions, not the survey format) and send revisions to the Standing Committee for approval; and
 - c. supervisor and Review Committee chair set deadlines for Review Committee tasks.

II. A. 1. Supervisor of the Administrator Under Review

The purpose of the five-year administrative review is to improve the professional development process for both academic and non-academic administrators. The review is to complement the routine annual reviews carried out by each administrator's direct supervisor by conducting a more in depth review involving several constituencies than is possible in annual reviews. The primary objective is to contribute to the supervisor's decision to retain in the position, retain with review in 18 months, or not retain the administrator. An additional goal is to develop those administrators who are retained. It is recognized that all individuals are capable of improvement regardless of how well they perform their duties.

Before proceeding, please familiarize yourself with the Administrative Review Timetable and the Guidelines for the Administrator under Review.

Planning Semester Tasks

1. The administrator will prepare a self-study with an updated vita attached. The supervisor and the administrator will work together to draw up a preliminary list of survey constituents who can provide **informed responses**.
2. It is recommended that the chair of the Review Committee consult with the supervisor on the timetable for the review and discuss general issues concerning the review.
3. Having received the self-study, the Review Committee can begin to function. At the first meeting of the Review Committee, the administrator and the supervisor will:
 - a. draw up a final list of people to receive survey questionnaires from a list of informed respondents; (the chair of the Review Committee and the supervisor will determine appropriate levels down the line when soliciting input for review of the chancellor, vice chancellors and non-academic administrators having limited direct contact with faculty); and
 - b. consult with the chair of the Review Committee in revising the generic survey questionnaire as needed and send revisions to the Standing Committee for approval.
4. Send Review Committees the most recent academic review documents.

In consultation with the chair of the Review Committee, the supervisor sets deadlines for Review Committee work on all of the above. Adherence to deadlines is crucial to the success of the entire process. Historically, delays have occurred in developing the questionnaires and the survey constituency lists. Do not get bogged down in these tasks. The process of conducting, managing and tabulating administrative reviews will tax the resources of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, even when everything is on track. OIRA relies on supervisors to keep the process on course. Failure to do so results in an unmanageable logjam.

Review Semester Tasks

One week after classes start, the first review begins:

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment sends out the first scheduled survey questionnaires and records responses as they arrive. The senior secretary, Cindy Lee, records verbatim responses as they arrive.

Six weeks later:

Review Committee receives the results of the survey and begins work on the Final Report.

Within thirty days:

Administrator under review, supervisor and the Review Committee (or chair) meet to review the Final Report.

Within thirty days:

The administrator, supervisor and Review Committee chair agree on and complete a Plan of Action. The plan must indicate how the review results will be shared with faculty and appropriate constituencies. The Plan of Action is sent to the chancellor for approval. Both the Plan of Action and Final Report are filed in the chancellor's office.

18 months later:

The supervisor will submit a progress report to the chancellor 18 months after the filing of the Plan of Action. Supervisor will send copies to the chairs of the Standing Committee and the Review Committee.

II. A. 2. Questionnaires

The Process

Information about the administrator under review is collected by survey questionnaires and by in-person interviews.

The administrator under review completes the self-study during the Planning Semester. The Review Committee, the administrator, and his/her supervisor hold their first meeting in the Planning Semester to:

- a. revise the survey questionnaire;
- b. finalize a list of constituencies to receive questionnaires; and
- c. schedule in-person interviews.

Issues Regarding the Development of Questionnaires

Administrative review questionnaires should be modified with sensitivity to the confidentiality and fairness issues raised by faculty and administrators during the evolution of the review process. Regarding confidentiality, demographic information on questionnaires has been changed or deleted to protect individual identities. To ensure fairness, questionnaires should be written so that respondents are asked only to evaluate dimensions or behaviors with which they have had personal experience. "Neutral" responses are included

on questionnaires to further ensure fairness and accuracy. As soon as survey data is converted into a computer format, the survey questionnaires are shredded immediately.

Characteristics of Survey Questionnaires

The administrative review process covers both academic administrators and non-academic administrators. In general, the generic questionnaire is designed for academic administrators. However, several questionnaires have been developed for non-academic administrators. See pages 56 - 66 for examples.

In general, Review Committees are free to suggest modifications and condensations of the existing forms, but are not to change the substance of the survey. In the case of an academic administrator, changes are not recommended. The ranges of questions presented were carefully selected by a Senate-Chancellor committee as being essential to the review process. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, which is responsible for managing and tabulating surveys, asks that the questionnaire format be retained. Change the questions, but not the format or the substance. All changes to the generic questionnaire must be approved by the Standing Committee.

Other Considerations

This is not a random sample survey. Questionnaires are mailed to constituencies chosen by the administrator, supervisor and the Review Committee. Survey questionnaires should be comprehensive, but concise. (There is widespread support for an abbreviated survey instrument.) Written comments on questionnaires are extremely important, particularly as questionnaires are abbreviated and when the response is particularly low.

Definition of Constituencies

Constituencies include faculty, other administrators, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, alumni, donors and others. The faculty and some part of the student body will always be surveyed. In general, selected constituencies should be able to provide informed responses.

Constituencies and Response Rates

Response rates among constituencies have varied greatly. In general, response from faculty, other administrators and graduate students has been good. Outside constituencies and undergraduate students have the lowest response rates.

In the case of outside constituencies, the original questionnaire proved to be inappropriate, so a short, single-sheet questionnaire has been used in which only three or four questions are asked (see page 64 of Appendix). This approach has been more successful and is recommended for use with outside constituencies.

Graduate students receive the same questionnaire that is sent to faculty and administrators. A separate questionnaire has been used with undergraduate students, but

response rates are still quite low. It is recommended that committees experiments with ways to obtain adequate undergraduate responses where needed; for example, holding group discussions at a convenient hour.

II. B. The Review Committee

Academic administrators at the level of department head and above, and non-academic administrators who report directly to a vice chancellor or to the chancellor, will be reviewed during the tenth semester in office. All administrators (including acting administrators) will be reviewed during the fourth semester after appointment to a new position.

The purpose of the five-year administrative review is to improve the professional development process for both academic and non-academic administrators. The review is to complement the routine annual reviews carried out by each administrator's direct supervisor. The primary objective is to contribute to the supervisor's decision to retain in the position, retain with review in 18 months, or not retain the administrator. An additional goal is to develop those administrators who are retained. It is recognized that all individuals are capable of improvement regardless of how well they perform their duties.

Before proceeding, please become familiar with the following sections: the Academic Review Timetable, Frequently Asked Questions, Guidelines for the Administrator Under Review, and Guidelines for the Review Committee Chair.

Composition of the Review Committee

The chair of each Review Committee is appointed by the Standing Committee. The members of each Review Committee are selected by the Faculty Senate caucus committees from the colleges. All committee members will be faculty who do not hold any appointments at the level of department head and above, unless specifically stated otherwise. In all cases, the Review Committee chair will be a faculty member.

Planning Semester Tasks

The administrative review is a two-semester process which includes a planning semester and the actual review semester. Summer semesters are excluded from the process because many faculty are away during the summers.

During the planning semester, confirmation letters go out to the administrator under review, the Review Committee chair and committee members. The administrator begins the self-study.

The Review Committee begins to function when the administrator's self-study has been completed. The process begins with the initial meeting of the administrator, supervisor and the entire Review Committee.

What to do at the first meeting:

- a. finalize the list of constituencies to be surveyed (the administrator and supervisor should have prepared a preliminary list prior to the first meeting);
- b. revise the generic survey as needed (change questions, not the survey format) and send revisions to the Standing Committee for approval;
- c. schedule in-person interviews at a neutral site; and
- d. Review Committee chair and supervisor set deadlines for committee tasks.

Two weeks later, the Standing Committee reviews questionnaire revisions. The questionnaire goes to Cindy Lee, senior secretary for the Office of the Chancellor, P260 Andy Holt Tower.

A WORD ABOUT DEADLINES: Adherence to deadlines is crucial to the success of the entire process. Historically, delays have occurred in developing the questionnaires and the survey constituency lists. Please do not get bogged down in these tasks. The process of conducting, managing and tabulating administrative reviews will tax the resources of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, even when everything is on track. OIRA relies on all participants to keep the process on course. Failure to do so results in an unmanageable logjam.

Regarding In-Person Interviews

Great care should be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the in-person interviews. In addition, it should be noted that the conditions under which people are interviewed affect the quality of their responses. Therefore, it is recommended by the UT legal counsel that committees:

- a. select an interview site that is well away from the administrator's building;
- b. select interview rooms with two exits so that people can come and go without being seen (a conference room in the College of Business Administration and rooms in the University Center are good choices);
- c. committees should meet with only one interviewee at a time, NOT with all the interviewees as a group;
- d. committees should generate an ANONYMOUS summary of statements made during the interview (anonymous statements may be incorporated into the Final Report). Do not record the name of the person being interviewed in personal notes. Personal notes should be made solely for the purpose of aiding recollection and should be destroyed as soon as the anonymous summary has been prepared.

According to UT legal counsel, written comments and personal notes taken during interviews are not considered a document unless they are copied and distributed to the committee. Any documentation of these notes CANNOT be destroyed and should be forwarded to Cindy Lee, senior secretary for the Office of the Chancellor, for placement in the administrator's data file.

Review Semester Tasks

One week after classes start:

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment sends out the first scheduled survey questionnaires and records responses as they arrive. Senior Secretary Cindy Lee records verbatim responses as they arrive. In-person interviews are scheduled.

Six weeks later:

The Review Committee receives the results of the survey and begins work on the Final Report which will be completed by the tenth week of the semester in which the review is conducted. See page 74 of the Appendix for an example of a Final Report. **The Final Report will include** a summary of how the committee has proceeded and will give some relevant statistics on the surveys sent out and returned. The body of the report should contain an assessment of the **strengths and weaknesses** of the administrator, with illustrative examples of survey results and verbatim comments relevant to each conclusion being presented. The actual transcribed verbatim comments and the detailed survey results will be retained in a file to be held by Cindy Lee, senior secretary for the Office of the Chancellor, should they ever be needed.

In the original version of the review process, the Review Committee was required to state whether the administrator should be retained in the position, retained with review in 18 months, or not retained. This requirement was too inflexible. Such an assessment is no longer required; however, the committee is expected to include any general observations that it considers important and may also still make a recommendation if it so desires. The questionnaires still contain a question asking the respondents to give their opinion on the question of retention and non-retention, and the committee is expected to give the results of the response to this question in its report. The committee is expected to make a series of recommendations for improvement of performance. The Final Report goes to the Standing Committee for approval. A copy of the Final Report goes to the administrator and the supervisor. Soon thereafter, the Review Committee and the administrator's supervisor will discuss the report.

Within thirty days:

The administrator under review, supervisor and the Review Committee meet to review the Final Report.

Within thirty days:

Administrator, supervisor and Review Committee chair will agree on and develop a Plan of Action, which will be written by the supervisor. The plan must specify how the review results will be shared with faculty and with appropriate constituencies. The Plan of Action goes to the chancellor for approval. (If necessary, the chancellor's office will send a reminder to the supervisor to finish the Plan of Action if the report is not received within six weeks.) The Final Report and Plan of Action are filed with Cindy Lee in the Office of the Chancellor.

Within 18 months of filing the Plan of Action:

The supervisor will submit a progress report to the chancellor. Copies will be sent to the chairs of the Standing Committee and Review Committee.

UTK Review Committee Structures

Department Heads

Review Committees will be composed of three faculty from outside departments.

Academic Deans

Review Committees will be composed of five members, one of whom may be a department head. All members will be from outside the college.

Associate/Assistant Deans

Review Committees will have three members. All members will be from outside the college.

The Chancellor

Review Committees will have seven members of whom one should be a department head and one a dean. The chair of the committee will be a faculty member.

Vice Chancellors

The Review Committee will be composed of five members, one of whom may be an academic dean or associate dean. The following recommendations are made for certain specific positions:

Academic Affairs: One member should be a department head.

Computing & Telecommunications: One or two members should have significant knowledge of computing.

Business Administration: One or two members should be from the College of Business Administration.

Development & Alumni Affairs: One member should be a department head.

Associate/Assistant Vice Chancellors

Review Committees will be composed of five members, one of whom may be a dean, associate dean or department head.

Directors, Non-Academic Deans and other Categories

Review Committees will be composed of three or five members who have no direct association with the administrative function, one of whom may be an appropriate level academic administrator. The decision on the size of any particular committee will be made by the Standing Committee.

II. B. 1. Chair of the Review Committee

Appointment

The chair of the Review Committee is appointed by the Standing Committee. Members of the Review Committee are appointed by Faculty Senate caucuses from the colleges. All committee members will be faculty who do not hold any appointments at the level of department head and above, unless specifically stated otherwise. In all cases, the Review Committee chair will be a faculty member.

Before proceeding, please become familiar with the following sections: the Administrative Review Timetable, Frequently Asked Questions, Guidelines for the Administrator Under Review, and Guidelines for the Review Committee.

Planning Semester Tasks

The administrative review is a two-semester process which includes a planning semester and the actual review semester.

It is recommended that the chair of the Review Committee consult as soon as possible with the administrator's supervisor to set the timetable for the review and discuss general issues associated with the review. Review committee heads should request the most recent academic review documents. Once the administrator under review has completed a self-study, the first meeting of the Review Committee takes place. At this meeting, the administrator, supervisor and the entire Review Committee will:

- a. finalize a list of constituencies to be surveyed;
- b. revise the generic survey as needed (change questions, not the survey format) and send revisions to the Standing Committee for approval;
- c. schedule in-person interviews; and
- d. the supervisor and Review Committee chair set deadlines for committee tasks.

Two weeks later, the Standing Committee reviews questionnaire revisions. The Chair of the Review Committee sends the approved survey questionnaire to Cindy Lee, senior secretary in the Office of the Chancellor, P260 Andy Holt Tower.

Review Semester Tasks

One week after classes start:

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment sends out survey questionnaires and records responses as they arrive. Senior Secretary Cindy Lee records verbatim responses as they arrive.

Six weeks later:

Review committee receives results of the survey and begins work on the Final Report, which will be completed by the tenth week of the semester in which the review is conducted. **The Final Report will include** a summary of how the committee has proceeded and will give some relevant statistics on the survey questionnaires sent out and returned. The body of the report should contain an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the administrator, with illustrative

examples of survey results and verbatim comments relevant to each conclusion being presented. The actual transcribed verbatim comments and the detailed survey results will be retained in a file in the Office of the Chancellor, should they ever be needed. In the original version of the review process, the Review Committee was required to state whether the administrator should be retained in the position, retained with review after 18 months, or not retained. This requirement was too inflexible. **It is no longer required** that such an assessment be made; however, the committee is expected to include any general observations that it considers important and may also still make a recommendation if it so desires. The questionnaires still contain a question asking the respondents to give their opinions on the question of retention and non-retention, and the committee is expected to give the results of the response to this question in its report. The committee is expected to make a series of recommendations for improvement of performance. An example of a Final Report can be found on page 74 of the Appendix.

The Final Report goes to the Standing Committee for approval. When approval is given, the Final Report then goes to the administrator and the supervisor. Soon thereafter, the Review Committee and the administrator's supervisor will meet to discuss the report.

Within thirty days:

Supervisor and Review Committee meet to review the Final Report.

Within thirty days:

The supervisor, the administrator and chair of the Review Committee will agree on and develop a Plan of Action, which will be written by the supervisor. **The plan must specify how the results of the review process will be shared with faculty and other relevant constituencies.** The Plan of Action goes to the chancellor for approval. (If necessary, the chancellor's office will send a reminder to the supervisor to finish the Plan of Action if the report is not received within six weeks.) The Final Report and Plan of Action are filed with Cindy Lee in the chancellor's office.

Within 18 months of filing the Plan of Action:

The supervisor will submit a progress report to the chancellor. Copies will be sent to the chair of the Standing Committee and Review Committee. When there is unsatisfactory progress in the opinion of either the chair of the Standing Committee or the chair of the Review Committee, either should request an interview with the chancellor and/or call a meeting of the original Review Committee. When the chancellor is being reviewed, and there is unsatisfactory progress, an interview with the President of the University of Tennessee should be requested to resolve the matter.

II. B. 2. Final Report

The Process

The Review Committee begins the Final Report after receiving the survey results. Once completed, the Final Report goes to the Standing Committee for approval. The supervisor and the Review Committee meet to review the Final Report. Then, the administrator, supervisor and Review Committee chair (or full committee) meet to review the report. The Final Report is filed in the Office of the Chancellor along with a Plan of Action.

Issues Relating to the Final Report

The five-year Administrative Review is only one aspect of an overall evaluation system. The review cannot encompass all aspects of administrative performance, and thus it is not required that the report conclude with recommendations for retention or non-retention of the administrator under review. The University structure delegates responsibility for these decisions to supervisors. Outcomes from these reviews will be taken seriously when personnel decisions are made, but they cannot be the sole evidence considered.

Characteristics of the Final Report

The Final Report should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the administrator in the areas of leadership, vision, governance, sensitivity and fairness. See page 74 in the Appendix for an example of a Final Report. The report will include a summary of how the committee has proceeded and will give some relevant statistics on the survey questionnaires sent out and returned. The body of the report should contain an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the administrator, with illustrative examples of survey results and verbatim comments relevant to each conclusion be presented. The actual transcribed verbatim comments and the detailed survey results will be retained in a file to be held by Cindy Lee, senior secretary for the Office of the Chancellor, should they ever be needed.

In the original version of the review process, the Review Committee was required to state whether the administrator should be retained in the position, retained with review in 18 months, or not retained. This requirement was too inflexible. It is no longer required that such an assessment be made; however, the committee is expected to include any general observations that it considers important and may also still make a recommendation if it so desires. The questionnaires still contain a question asking the respondents to give their opinions on the question of retention and non-retention, and the committee is expected to give the results of the response to this question in its report. The committee is expected to make a series of recommendations for improvement of performance.

Comments from in-person interviews and data from surveys should be incorporated into the text to provide examples and to support statements and conclusions. The report should be three to five pages long. The actual survey results and transcribed verbatim comments are retained in a data file in the Office of the Chancellor.

Dissemination of the Final Report

The information contained in both the Final Report and the Plan of Action is open to the public and to the University community in accordance with the laws of the State of Tennessee. The Plan of Action should specify how the review results will be shared with faculty and relevant constituencies. Persons wishing access to this information may make a written request to the chancellor.

II. B. 3. Plan of Action

The Process

Following completion of the Final Report, the supervisor of the administrator under review and chair of the Review Committee will agree on and develop a Plan of Action, which will be written by the supervisor, and approved by all three. (See page 80 in the Appendix for an example of a Plan of Action).

Once completed, the Plan of Action will be forwarded to the chancellor for review and approval (except in the case of a review of vice-chancellors when the Plan of Action will be forwarded to the president of the University of Tennessee).

Copies of the Final Report and the approved Plan of Action will be forwarded to the Standing Committee. A copy of the Final Report and the Plan of Action will be retained in the chancellor's office. The Plan of Action also will be maintained in the file of the administrator's direct supervisor.

Arbitration

In the event that the supervisor and the Review Committee chair cannot agree on the Plan of Action, the matter is referred to the Standing Committee for arbitration.

Characteristics of the Plan of Action

The Plan of Action is to be written by the supervisor of the administrator under review, with assistance from the chair of the Review Committee. If the report is not received within six weeks, the chancellor's office will send a written reminder to the supervisor. Plans of Action generally are one page in length.

Dissemination of the Plan of Action

The information contained in both the Plan of Action and the Final Report is open to the public and to the University community in accordance with the laws of the State of Tennessee. Persons wishing access to this information may make a written request to the chancellor. The Plan of Action will specify how the review results will be shared with faculty and relevant constituencies.

II. C. The Standing Committee

The five-year administrative review process is to be supervised by a Standing Committee that is advisory to the chancellor.

Duties of the Standing Committee

- a. appoint the Review Committee chair for each academic administrator (Faculty Senate caucus committees from each college will appoint the members of the Review Committee);
- b. appoint the entire Review Committee for each non-academic administrator;
- c. supervise and refine the review process as it develops;
- d. oversee the extent of compliance with recommendations of the Review Committees;
- e. answer questions and offer advice as appointed liaisons to each Review Committee;
- f. review, finalize and approve any changes made to the standard survey questionnaire; and
- g. ensure that the Final Report conforms to recommendations of the UT legal counsel.

Composition of the Standing Committee

The Standing Committee will be composed of seven faculty members. Five members will be distinguished senior faculty appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate, the remaining two members will be appointed by the chancellor. The chair of the Standing Committee will be appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate.

Term of Office

The members of the Standing Committee will serve three years. Appointments will be staffed to ensure a reasonable rotation. The Standing Committee will be activated every semester in a timely manner by the executive assistant to the chancellor. Records will be kept by Cindy Lee, senior secretary in the Office of the Chancellor.

Chair of the Standing Committee

The chair is appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate and is responsible for the overall administrative review process. He/she serves for one year. The chair may also serve as an arbitrator; for example, when the supervisor of the administrator under review and the chair of the Review Committee cannot agree, they should consult the chair of the Standing Committee for a ruling.

In the case of unsatisfactory progress in the opinion of either the chair of the Standing Committee or the Chair of the Review committee, either should request an interview with the chancellor and/or call a meeting of the original Review Committee. In the case of a review of the chancellor, the interview will be with the President of the University of Tennessee.

VI. Directory and Timetable

A. Standing Committee Directory

Members	Phone	E-Mail	Campus Address	FAX	Term Expires	Selected by
Kathy E. Bohstedt, Chair	974-3255	kbohsted@utk.edu	Philosophy – 0480	974-3509	August, 2000	Faculty Senate Pres.
Randall Bresee	974-0838	rbresee@utk.edu	Textile, Retail & Consumer Sci – 1900	974-5236	Sept., 2000	Faculty Senate Pres.
Norma Cook	974-7067	ncook@utk.edu	Speech Comm. – 0405	974-4879	April, 1999	Chancellor
Kevin Hahn	974-8387	khahn@utk.edu	Comparative Med. – 4500	974-5640	Sept, 2001	Faculty Senate Pres.
Robert Heller	974-3463	rheller@utk.edu	Journalism - 0330	974-3896	Sept., 1999	Faculty Senate Pres.
Denise Jackson	974-5578	djackson@utk.edu	Industrial Engr – 1506	974-2617	April, 1999	Chancellor
Kula Misra	974-6020	kmisra@utk.edu	Geology – 1410	974-2368	Sept, 2001	Faculty Senate Pres.

Chancellor's Office

Marianne Woodside, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor	974-2258	mwoodsie@utk.edu	533 Andy Holt Tower – 0150	974-3536
Lori Epperson, Senior Administrative Services Assistant	974-2268	lepperson@utk.edu	527 Andy Holt Tower - 0150	974-3536
Cindy Lee, Senior Secretary	974-2247	tclee1@utk.edu	Dir. Of Finance Office - 0109	974-1620

Office of Institutional Research

Nancy W. Waller Survey Project Manager	974-1429	nwaller@utk.edu	Institutional Research - 4122	974-1428
---	----------	--	-------------------------------	----------

B. Administrative Review Timetable

Timeline	Action
The Planning Semester ...	
Beginning of calendar year ...	Human Resources updates a list of all administrators for the Standing Committee.
Beginning of each term ...	Standing Committee determines who is eligible for review. Final list goes to the chancellor for approval. Review Committee chair is appointed. Review Committees are appointed by Faculty Senate college caucuses.
30 days later ...	Confirmation letters go out to administrators under review, the Review Committee chair and committee members. Administrators under review begin self-study.
30 days later ...	Review Committee begins to function after completion of the self-study. At the first meeting, the administrator, supervisor and entire committee will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make a list of people to receive survey questionnaires; 2. Revise generic survey questionnaire as needed and send revisions to the Standing Committee for approval; and 3. Schedule in-person interviews. Supervisor and Review Committee chair set deadlines for Review Committee.
Two weeks later ...	Standing Committee reviews questionnaire revisions. Questionnaire goes to Cindy Lee, senior secretary, Office of the Chancellor. OIR schedules reviews.
The Review Semester. . .	
One week after classes start, the first review begins ...	Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) sends out the first <i>scheduled</i> survey questionnaires and records responses as they arrive. Cindy Lee records verbatim responses as they arrive. Interviews are scheduled for those who request them.
6 weeks later ...	Review Committee receives the results of the survey; begins work on Final Report.
30 days later ...	Final Report goes to Standing Committee for approval.
30 days later ...	Administrator, supervisor and Review Committee meet to review Final Report.
30 days later ...	Supervisor and Review Committee chair complete Plan of Action, which goes to the chancellor for approval. The Plan of Action and Final Report are sent to Cindy Lee in the Office of the Chancellor.

Note: This timeline provides a quick overview. Consult the individual guidelines for complete instructions .

VII. Glossary of Key Terms and Individuals

Administrators who may be eligible for review are identified by the Department of Human Resources, and their names are forwarded to the Standing Committee for final selection. The list of eligible administrators goes to the chancellor for approval.

Chair of the Standing Committee, Dr. Kathy Bohstedt, is responsible for the over-all administrative review process. She is located at 801 McClung Tower, phone 974-255.

Chancellor William T. Snyder is responsible for ensuring that all administrators are systematically reviewed by their supervisors. He also appoints two members of the Standing Committee.

Constituencies include faculty, other administrators, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, alumni, donors and others. The faculty and some part of the student body will always be surveyed.

Executive Assistant to the Chancellor, Dr. Marianne Woodside, has overall responsibility for records management.

Faculty are defined strictly as those who do not hold administrative appointments at the level of department head and above.

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) is responsible for scheduling a timetable to implement surveys, and for distributing and tabulating the survey questionnaires. OIRA is located at 600 Henley Street, Suite 208, phone 974-4373.

Review Committee finalizes the list of constituencies to be surveyed; revises the generic survey questionnaire as needed; schedules in-person interviews; develops questionnaires for outside constituencies and writes the Final Report.

Semester refers to Fall and Spring semesters. Summer semesters are excluded because many faculty are away during the summer.

Senior Secretary for the Office of the Chancellor, Cindy Lee, coordinates the paperwork, filing, assists the chair of the Standing Committee and the Review Committees, and records the verbatim survey responses. Ms. Lee is located at P260 Andy Holt Tower, phone 974-2247.

Standing Committee appoints the Review Committee chair for each administrator; supervises and refines the review process as it develops; oversees the extent of compliance with recommendations of the Review Committees; answers questions as appointed liaisons to the Review Committees; and reviews, finalizes and approves changes made to the standard survey questionnaire.

Note: Queries about procedures should be forwarded to Dr. Bohstedt or to Cindy Lee.

V. Frequently Asked Questions

Who is eligible for administrative review?

Academic administrators at the level of department head and above, and non-academic administrators who report directly to a vice chancellor or the chancellor, will be reviewed during the tenth semester in office (excluding Summer Semester) and every five years thereafter. All administrators (including acting administrators) will be reviewed during the fourth semester after appointment to a new position.

How will confidentiality be protected?

Several steps have been taken to ensure confidentiality. Regarding survey questionnaires, demographic information about survey respondents has been changed or deleted to protect individual identities. Review committees are urged to conduct in-person interviews individually and in a separate building from the administrator's work area. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment ensures the highest degree of confidentiality in entering and processing survey data. Verbatim comments are transcribed, and the originals are destroyed to prevent identification through handwriting. As soon as the survey data are converted into a computer format, the survey questionnaires are shredded immediately.

Will the contents of the Final Report and Plan of Action be available to faculty?

Both reports will be retained in a file by the executive assistant to the chancellor and will be accessible to the University community and the general public in a manner consistent with the laws of the State of Tennessee. Persons wishing to review these files should submit a written request to the chancellor. The administrator's supervisor will retain a copy of the Plan of Action, specifying how the results of the review process will be shared with faculty and relevant constituencies.

Are we to review the administrator, or the program for which he or she is responsible? How do you separate the two in the review process?

The five-year administrative review process focuses on the effectiveness of the administrator and how he/she can improve. How well his/her office or program functions is another type of review. More than anything else, you are asked to determine how the administrator can do a better job. For example, the most common criticism of administrators is lack of communications skills. This deficiency can greatly impact the effectiveness of the administrator's office or program. Identifying this problem and others like it is the focus of the administrative review.

How will information about the administrator be collected?

Data will be gathered through survey questionnaires and personal interviews.

Who determines the list of respondents for the survey?

The list of respondents is developed by the administrator under review, the supervisor and the Review Committee. Together, they work on a list of people who can provide *informed feedback*. The Review Committee has the final say on the list of respondents. If the administrator, supervisor and Review Committee cannot agree on this list, then the matter goes to the Standing Committee for final arbitration.

How large should the list of respondents be?

It depends on the administrator being reviewed. In the case of a department head, you would want to survey the faculty, staff and graduate students. There also might be informed outsiders, such as alumni, colleagues in other universities, and business leaders who can comment effectively. In any event, concentrate on pulling together the largest possible list of *informed respondents*.

Can the survey questionnaires be changed?

The questionnaires that have been developed generally work well for academic administrators, but may need modifying for non-academic administrators. Certain questions may not be appropriate or relevant for a specific non-academic administrator. When modifying the questionnaire, please keep in mind that the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) has to analyze these data. OIRA would like the questionnaires to be as uniform as possible.

Who determines what questions will be asked?

The Review Committee in consultation with the administrator and the immediate supervisor should determine which questions should be added, deleted or changed; however, the final decision on any question lies with the Standing Committee who must approve each questionnaire.

What happens when not enough surveys are returned to be statistically meaningful?

In those cases, the written comments will matter a great deal. Personal interviews will also help to supply the information you need.

What should be the focus of the Final Report?

Please keep in mind that the five-year administrative review is only part of the total review picture. The Final Report will contribute to the supervisor's decision to retain in the position, retain with review in 18 months, or not retain the administrator. Because ultimate responsibility for the continuation decision rests with the supervisor, it is recommended that the Final Report should emphasize the following areas: *leadership, vision, governance, values projected, sensitivity, and fairness* – areas that tend to be sources of problems to faculty, staff and students. Emphasis should be on *strengths and weaknesses*. The review cannot encompass all aspects of administrative performance. It would be inappropriate, therefore, to

require that the Final Report contain recommendations for retention or non-retention, unless insoluble problems have been uncovered. Those decisions are left to the supervisor of the administrator. If a committee wishes to make a recommendation, they may do so.

What will happen to specific recommendations that come from the review of administrators? Are these outcomes to be considered as binding on the supervisors of the person being reviewed?

According to Chancellor Snyder: "This cannot be the case, given the fact that administrators are appointed and not elected. The SCEOA process will result in one set of data that will help supervisors make wise personnel decisions. The recommendations will certainly be given serious, good-faith consideration, but they cannot be binding on supervisors, leaving no room for further dialogue or discussion. The evaluation framework clearly has the expectation that if performance deficiencies are deemed serious enough that a person cannot continue effectively as an administrator unless the deficiencies of performance are remedied, then clearly removal as an administrator is an option that may have to be exercised. In considering performance reviews, it is important to realize that we are dealing with human beings, their careers, and their professional reputations. There will be no public vengeance or humiliation practiced against anyone in this university as a result of a change in administrative responsibilities. I cannot emphasize this point too strongly." (Source: *CONTEXT*, January 27, 1995).