

February 1, 1990

That public accountability is best guaranteed through performance evaluation is a principle which is widely accepted with respect to instruction. In the Fall Semester alone, there were at least four teaching evaluation programs in operation on the UTK campus. Though evaluation is common for faculty, it is neither common nor methodical for campus administrators. As an organization representing the interests of UTK faculty, AAUP is primarily concerned with the performance of *academic* administrators (department heads, program directors, college deans, provost or vice-chancellor for academic affairs, chancellor). We therefore recommend for consideration by the Chancellor and the Faculty Senate the following statement concerning faculty evaluation of administrators.

1. Regular and periodic evaluations of administrators will serve personal and institutional goals.

The goals of evaluation of administrators, like the goals of evaluation of teaching, are commonly identified as judgmental, influencing future performance through the reward system, and developmental, encouraging preparation for future performance through self-learning and personal growth.¹

Other and more specific purposes of evaluation include the following:

- To answer external and internal demands for accountability;²
- To assist university officers in establishing and attaining institutional goals, e.g. by educating trustees and the general public;³ and
- To offer to administrators protection from arbitrary removal.⁴

2. In the evaluation of *academic* administrators, the primary voice should be that of the faculty.

This principle is based on three arguments:

- Faculty are not just *a* constituency on the campus, but are the principal custodians of the institution's history, traditions, mission, and standards.⁵
- The authority of an academic administrator is in part delegated by the faculty who assisted in the search procedure.⁶
- Participatory management is based on the belief that a highly educated work force has ideas of value, and that the satisfaction, commitment, and productivity of that work force will increase when their ideas are heard.⁷

That faculty are the primary evaluators does not preclude participation in the assessment process by fellow administrators, students, trustees, or others with whom the administrator works. The review committee might judge, for example, that in the evaluation of the Chancellor special consideration should be given to reports from the College Deans and Program Directors, and that in the evaluation of Deans special consideration should be given to reports from Department Heads.

3. The faculty therefore endorse the 1981 AAUP policy statement on “The Evaluation of Administrators.”

That statement, as drafted by Committee T on College and University Government and adopted as AAUP policy at the June 1981 Annual Meeting, is as follows: “Institutions should develop procedures for periodic review of the performance of presidents and academic administrators. The purpose of such periodic reviews should be the improvement of the performance of the administrator during his or her term of office. This review should be conducted on behalf of the governing board for the president, or on behalf of the appointing administrator for other academic administrators. Fellow administrators, faculty, students, and others should participate in the review according to their legitimate interest in the result, with faculty of the unit accorded the primary voice in the case of academic administrators. The governing board or appointing administrator should publish a summary of the review, including a statement of actions taken as a result of the review.”⁸

4. Consistent with their primary interest in the evaluation process, faculty should have the major role in designing suitable evaluation procedures.

While specific procedures will vary from case to case, the following guidelines should receive special consideration:

- Where academic administrators are concerned, review committee membership should have a faculty majority.⁹
- Faculty members of review committees should be chosen by the faculty themselves (e.g., by a department committee or by the nominating committee of the Faculty Senate), and should not be subject to prior screening by the administration.
- The work of the review committee should not terminate with the filing of its report, but should include monitoring of actions taken with respect to the recommendations of the report.
- Evaluation of administrative work is described in the same language as is evaluation of faculty teaching and advising.¹⁰ Since in the latter cases it is widely agreed that assessment for improvement and assessment for personnel decisions must be carefully distinguished,¹¹ more than one procedure may be necessary to accomplish the goals of evaluation of administrators.
- The need for openness and accountability as recognized in Tennessee’s public records law should be balanced against the need for some confidentiality.¹² So far as is possible, AAUP recommends a public report which would be limited to job-related information and would *not* include the names of the evaluators.

Notes

¹ Edward Baum, "Evaluating the Evaluation Process for Academic Administrators," *College and University* 58, No. 2 (Winter 1983): 182–93. See also Charles H. Farmer, "The Faculty Role in Administrator Evaluation," *New Directions for Higher Education* 6, No. 2 (1978): 41–49, and Paul Strohm, "Toward an AAUP Policy on Evaluation of Administrators," *Academe* 66, No. 8 (Dec. 1980): 406–13.

² Charles P. Fisher, *The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977).

³ Lawrence J. Dennis and Kelly Bullerdieck, "Faculty Role in Presidential Evaluations," *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 37, No. 3 (Fall 1986): 1–4.

⁴ Strohm (1980): 408.

⁵ "Faculty members carry the value system of the college or university; i.e., they are the institution in terms of performance, values, interactions, meaning, significance, and ... productivity" (G. Lester Anderson, *The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes* 1975 [ERIC ED 129 198]: 19).

⁶ "His [the president's] leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty"—*Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, formulated in 1966 by AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. See *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports 1984* (Washington, D.C.: AAUP, 1988): 105–10.

⁷ David A. Nichols, "Challenging Chait on Theory Z," *AGB Reports* 24, No. 4 (July/Aug. 1982): 12.

⁸ *Academe* 67, No. 5 (Oct. 1981): 324; *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports 1984*: 112.

⁹ A faculty majority on academic review committees is the policy at two of UT's "peer" schools, Indiana and Florida. At Brooklyn College, the review committees consisted *entirely* of faculty; see Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "Faculty Evaluation of Administrators: The Experience of Brooklyn College," *AAUP Bulletin* 64, No. 4 (Dec. 1978): 298–304.

¹⁰ In both cases, evaluation is described as either "formative" or "summative." Compare, for example, Howard C. Kramer, "The Assessment of Advising," *National Conference on Academic Advising*, ed. Gina Rayfield et al., Proceedings of the First Annual Conference on Academic Advising, Burlington, Vermont, Oct. 16–19, 1977: 52–53 (ERIC ED 224 411), and Elizabeth C. Fisk and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Presidential Evaluation: The State of the Art," *Liberal Education* 65 (1979): 344.

¹¹ W. Lee Humphreys, "The Evaluation of Instructors and Related Personnel Decisions," *Teaching-Learning Issues* No. 54 (Fall 1984): 9; Charles F. Cremer and Michael Ryan, "New Technique Lets Students Evaluate Academic Advising," *Journalism Educator* 39 (Spring 1984): 21–22; and Kramer (1977).

¹² For one representative statement of concern, see Kenneth A. Shaw, "Presidential Assessment: Good Intentions Gone Wrong," *AGB Reports* 27, No. 6 (Nov.–Dec. 1985): 20–23. On the other hand, accountability requires public information, and a public report would offer protection to administrators who might otherwise be removed upon the assertion of unfavorable information in a secret committee report.