

REPORT
OF
SENATE-CHANCELLOR COMMITTEE TO IMPLEMENT
A PROGRAM OF
REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS

Following on the recommendations of an earlier Senate-Chancellor committee, the current committee was formed earlier this year and given the charge of developing an implementation policy. It was the directive of the Faculty Senate that the policy to be developed for implementation would consider the Report of the prior committee and also comments made during the discussion of that report by the Faculty Senate. It should be recalled that in that meeting there were several points of considerable importance made and that the Senate agreed to accept the report at that time only if the implementation committee were to consider seriously the comments made during the Senate meeting.

Our original charge from Chancellor Quinn was to have a policy in place by the end of the spring semester, so that it could function during the 1992-93 academic year. Since the committee was unable to meet prior to April 6, it would have been impossible to develop an appropriate policy document by early May. Our adopted schedule was to have a policy to the Faculty Senate by early November at the latest, so that the review process can begin in January 1993. At its first meeting, Paul J. Phillips was "elected" the committee chair.

The members of the committee are:

Paul J. Phillips, Professor of Materials Science and Engineering, Chair
Jerry Askew, Dean of Students
Roger Jenkins, Assoc. Dean of Business Administration
Susan Martin, Head and Associate Professor of Classics
Jack Reese, Professor of English & former Chancellor
Eunice Shatz, Dean of Social Work
Richard Strange, Professor of Forestry

Submitted to the Senate Executive Committee 31 August 1992

PREAMBLE

Following the recommendation of the previous Senate-Chancellor committee, this committee recommends the institution of reviews for administrators at five year intervals. The committee further recommends that new administrators be evaluated after eighteen months, as is common in the non-academic world. The primary objective of the evaluation is to recommend whether or not the administrator should be retained in the position for an additional five years or, in the case of new administrators, for the remainder of the first term of five years.

The purpose of the five-year review is to complement the routine annual reviews carried out by each administrator's direct supervisor. The primary objective is to recommend whether or not the administrator should be retained in the position for an additional five years. An additional goal is the development of the administrators that are retained. It is recognized that all individuals are capable of improvement regardless of how well they are performing their duties.

The review process is to be supervised by a Standing Committee that is advisory to the Chancellor. The duties of the Standing Committee will be to appoint the Review Committees for each administrator, to supervise and refine the review process as it is developed over the next few years, and to oversee the extent of compliance with recommendations of the Review Committees.

A secondary goal of this process is the improvement of the administrators who continue to serve. Throughout its proceedings the committee has worked on the premise that this new review process will not replace the annual reviews of administrators that are expected to be carried out by their immediate supervisors. The committee recognizes that these annual reviews serve an important developmental goal in allowing the administrator and the supervisor to monitor developing problems and recognize successful performance on a regular basis. It also recognizes that these annual reviews may not be conducted on a regular basis currently by all administrative supervisors. It is important that the administration of the University ensure that such reviews are conducted in a regular, timely and objective manner. The committee also recommends that the university intensify the number of courses it offers for administrators and makes them available to more administrators. They should be made available to all new administrators.

The committee has recognized throughout that the Review Process marks a watershed in administration-faculty relations and that it is of great importance to the future development of the University. It has tried throughout to generate a policy document that will engender a spirit of collegiality between faculty and administrators in working for the common good. It realizes that the policy developed has to serve a dual function, encompassing the short-term needs of a transition in campus attitudes with the long term needs of a continuing policy embodying mutual trust. In some respects the needs are in conflict with one another. When a greater level of trust has been engendered some monitoring procedures will be obsolete and could be discarded.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. REVIEW PROGRAM

1.1 All administrators at the level of Department Head, or equivalent, and above will be reviewed during the tenth semester¹ in office.

1.2 All administrators (including acting administrators) will be reviewed during the fourth semester after appointment to a new position.

1.3 The review process will be overseen by a Standing Committee of seven. The functions of the Standing Committee will be to oversee and refine the review process, to appoint the Review Committees for each administrator and to monitor progress on specific recommendations.

1.4 Five members of the Standing Committee will be distinguished senior faculty appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate, the remaining two members being appointed by the Chancellor. The chair of the Standing Committee will be appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate.

1.5 The term of office of members of the Standing Committee will be three years and the appointments staggered to assure a reasonable rotation.

1.6 For the Standing Committee and the Review Committees, faculty are defined strictly as those faculty who do not hold administrative appointments at the department head level and above.

1.7 Records will be kept, and the Standing Committee activated every semester in a timely manner, by the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor.

¹ Throughout this document the word "semester" refers to fall and spring semesters and excludes summers.

2. REVIEW PROCEDURES

2.1 Review committees for each administrator and the committee chairs will be appointed by the Standing Committee.

2.2 Review committee appointments will be made in the semester prior to that in which the review is to be conducted.

2.3 Opinions and information will be gathered primarily by questionnaire. All committees will provide adequate time for direct testimony by faculty and all other constituencies.

2.4 All proceedings will be fully confidential and anonymity retained except when agreed to in advance by a respondent.

2.5 All reviews will begin with the preparation of a self-study document¹ by the administrator being reviewed. An up-to-date curriculum vitae should be attached as an appendix to the document.

2.6 The second step in the review process will be a meeting between the review committee, the administrator under review and the administrator's direct supervisor to discuss the constituencies to be surveyed. At that time attention will also be paid to the refinement of the actual questionnaires to be used in the review process²

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

2.8 Alongside the review of the administrator, a review should be conducted of the organization of the office. This review will be used later as background information during the review of the administrator's associates and assistants.

2.9 The Report of each Review Committee will be completed by the tenth week of the semester in which the review is conducted. The report will include

- (a) the questionnaire with mean responses shown³
- (b) a totally anonymous summary of interview comments
- (c) general observations and recommendations

¹ See Appendix A.

² See Appendix B.

³ When a sufficient number of reviews have been conducted, statistical data for administrators in a similar position, by college and/or campus where appropriate, should also be given.

3. REPORTING AND FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

3.1 The Report will be sent to the direct supervisor of the administrator being reviewed, with a copy being sent to the administrator under review. Shortly thereafter a discussion of the report will be held between the review committee and the administrator's direct supervisor.

3.2 (a) For an administrator being reappointed, a Plan of Action will be developed by the direct supervisor in consultation with the administrator being reviewed and the chair of the Review Committee.

(b) For an administrator not continuing for another term, for whatever reason, notification of the action will be forwarded to the Standing Committee and the Review Committee.

3.3 The Plan of Action will be forwarded to the Chancellor for review and approval in all cases but those of Vice-Chancellors, when it will be forwarded to the President. Copies of the Report and the Approved Plan of Action will be forwarded to the Standing Committee. The Review Committee will then be asked to prepare a single sheet summary of the Plan of Action.

3.4 The Report and the Summarized Plan of Action 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.¹ It is strongly recommended that each administrator share the report and the Summarized Plan of Action with the relevant faculty. The detailed Plan of Action will be maintained in the file of the administrator's direct supervisor.

3.5 A Progress Report will be submitted to the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor by the direct supervisor eighteen months after the filing of the Plan of Action. Copies will be sent to the Chair of the Standing Committee and the Chair of the Review Committee.²

3.6 In a 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 the Chancellor the interview will be with the President.²

¹ Two members of the committee dissent from this recommendation and prefer that the file be a closed file.

² One member of the committee objects to sections 3.5 and 3.6.

4. REVIEW COMMITTEE STRUCTURES

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 chair of the review committee will be a faculty member.

The reasoning here has been to follow the appointment structure currently utilized in Graduate School reviews with some modifications for administrators above the level of Department Head. It is believed that this procedure will eliminate the effects of any protectionism. It should also ensure a clear and open response from respondents and minimize the possibility of recriminations.

4.1 Department Heads

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

4.2 Academic Deans

Review Committees will be comprised of five members, one of whom may be a Department Head. At least three will be from outside the college, the chair being appointed from amongst those three.

4.3 Associate/Assistant Deans

Review Committees will have three members. At least two will be from outside the college, the chair being appointed from amongst those two.

4.4 The Chancellor

The Review Committee will have seven members, of which one should be a Department Head and one a Dean. The chair of the committee will be a faculty member.

4.5 Vice-Chancellors

Review Committees 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:

1. Academic Affairs. One member should be a department head.
2. Computing & Telecommunications. One or two members should have significant knowledge of computing.
3. Business & Finance. One or two members should be from the College of Business.
4. Development & Alumni Affairs. One member should be a department head.

4.6 Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellors

Review committees will be composed of five members, one of whom may be a Dean,

Associate Dean or Department Head.

It is recommended that attention to be paid to the specific functions of the administrators in terms of the expertise and experience of the committee members to be appointed.

4.7 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.

It is recommended that attention be paid to the specific functions of the administrators in terms of the expertise and experience of the committee members to be appointed.

5. REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

Some specimens of the questionnaires,¹ which contain essential specific questions that must be asked during the review process, are attached as part of Appendix B. They have been formulated specifically for use with faculty and other administrators, but are also appropriate for use by students, alumni and others. The response category NB permits questions inappropriate for certain responding groups to be ignored as necessary. Questionnaires for administrators with restricted job functions will differ from those attached in that an additional sheet of specific questions of relevance to the job function may also be helpful.

It is recognized that each specific Review Committee has the responsibility of ensuring that the questionnaire they use contains relevant specific questions not listed on the sheets of Appendix B. Removal of any of the questions listed in the sheets of Appendix B would have to be justified beforehand with the Standing Committee.

¹ The questionnaires have been devised after considering (a) those used during the review of selected Deans three years ago, (b) those devised recently by the UT branch of the AAUP, and (c) comments on the AAUP forms from administrators. Also foremost in our considerations was the need for an effective review process which was also anonymous and fair to all concerned. It is believed that the detailed questionnaires ensure that responses are serious, well thought-out and fair to those being reviewed. Respondents have the option of signing Sheet 5, if they wish to have an interview with the Review Committee.

6. SCHEDULE

There are two schedules to be followed,¹ one for all administrators and one for new administrators.

(a) The principles to be used in the scheduling of the five-year review process are as follows:

1. The process will be scheduled so that the task is spread evenly over a five-year period (ten semesters).

2. For each class of administrator the order will be that of longevity in the position. [For example, there are five Vice-Chancellors; they would be reviewed one per year in the order of time in office, the Chancellor being reviewed in the fifth year of office. There are fifteen academic deans; three would be reviewed each academic year, the order being determined by the time in office.]

3. Associate and assistant administrators in any office should be reviewed during the year following the review of their direct supervisor. The organization of the office will be reviewed at the same time as the direct supervisor, so that the associates and assistants can be reviewed in the context of the limitations of the office organization.

(b) In the case of the review of administrators appointed to new positions the schedule is self-explanatory, namely that they will be reviewed after three semesters in office. They will be reviewed again on the regular five-year schedule during the tenth semester in office.

¹ The schedules are in the process of being prepared and may be available for the October 1992 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

APPENDIX A

Self-study Document for Administrators: Guidelines

Prepare a self-study document in which you respond individually to each of the following areas:

1. Write a description of your position including all of the major areas of responsibility it entails.
2. How is the unit organized to carry out the major areas of responsibility ?
3. Describe your management style. How do you reach decisions concerning the allocation of fiscal and personnel resources within the unit?
4. What role does the faculty play in the governance of the unit?
5. Describe how you interact with the various constituencies of the unit within the university; in the academic world; in the community; nationally and internationally.
6. Describe how you continue your academic and professional development despite the demands of your administrative responsibilities.

Attach a recent copy of the curriculum vitae to the study.

APPENDIX B

This appendix contains some of the questionnaires that have been designed by the committee for use during the evaluation process. They contain questions that the committee believes essential to all or most administrators. The exact form of any question may be modified by professional psychometricians prior to final approval of the questionnaire by the Review Committee and the Standing Committee. Justification for removal of any of the mandated questions must be made by the Review Committee to the Standing Committee prior to change. The Review Committee may wish to add extra questions through the use of a sheet entitled "Specific Job Functions" if deemed necessary.

The specific style of all questions on the Questionnaire, relevant to its computerized evaluation, will be considered by the aforementioned professionals, who will interact with the committees.

The Questionnaires have been modified from the one designed for Deans to be specific to the other classes of administrator being reviewed. In the case of administrators with specific or restricted job functions other questions will be appropriate and should be added through the use of the "Specific Job Functions" sheet . It will be the task of the Standing Committee and the particular Review Committee to finalize the questionnaires to be used in each case.

Attached are the questionnaires for the following administrators:

1. Department Heads
2. Academic Deans
3. The Chancellor

Several others have been formulated along the lines of those provided, but are not attached.

Please note that pages 4 and 5 are common to all questionnaires and have been provided only for the Department Head questionnaire.