

# Procedural Guidelines in the Appointment and Evaluation of University Administrators<sup>1</sup>

Commented [A1]: New addition to title

## A. Selection of Key Academic Administrators

1. Formal search committees will be constituted with the assistance of the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee when administrative vacancies develop in any of the following positions:
  - Provost
  - Academic Dean of a School or College of the University<sup>2</sup>
  - Chair of an Academic Department in one of the Colleges
  - Dean of University Libraries
2. Upon expectation of a vacancy in one of the above-listed positions, the president or a vice president acting as his or her representative, will, as soon as possible, consult with the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee to agree upon the most reasonable course to be followed in filling the vacant post. The Faculty Senate Agenda Committee will be given its charge and a time line for fulfilling it. Normally, the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee will then create an *ad hoc* Faculty Search Committee (the "Committee"), composed as indicated in the guidelines below (see B 1-2), to assist in the evaluation of candidates for the vacant position and fulfill the charge.
3. The Committee will meet with the provost or their representative<sup>3</sup> and receive specific information as to the kind of selection process to be undertaken. Usually one of the following three alternatives applies.
  - a. Conduct a broad search both inside and outside the university for the best candidates available within the financial guidelines indicated by the provost.
  - b. Conduct a search for the best available internal candidate.
  - c. Make a candid evaluation of the qualifications and potential of a specific candidate who is being considered, surveying opinions of other faculty members and contrasting the named candidate with any other candidates whom the Committee determines should be considered.

In the cases of A.3.a & A.3.b, the Committee will be expected to develop a list of candidates with evaluations of each. In A.3.c, the Committee will report its evaluation of a single candidate.

---

<sup>1</sup>Promulgated by the President May 19, 1973. Current language approved by the Faculty Senate on 4/4/2018 and approved by the Board of Trustees on 4/13/2018.

<sup>2</sup>Or equivalent position

<sup>3</sup>In the case of a Provost search, the Committee reports to the President or President's designee in sections A.3

4. The Committee charged with seeking out candidates for an administrative vacancy will develop a list of potential candidates. This process assumes diligent outreach efforts and may be conducted with the help of a professional search firm. After screening all initial applicants, the most promising candidates will be interviewed separately by the Committee to develop a slate of candidates. The slate of candidates will be invited to campus for full-day (or multi-day) visits to make presentations to and meet with relevant constituents and to meet with any administrative officers directly concerned with the appointment. The campus visits will be jointly arranged by the Committee and the Office of the Provost.
5. Following the campus interviews, the Committee will develop a final report presenting to the provost or representative a final list of recommended nominees with evaluations of each.
6. The provost or representative will give careful consideration to the nominees proposed by the Committee and, in the unusual situation when no nominee is suitable, may ask the Committee to consider for evaluation and recommendation additional well-qualified candidates referred to the president or provost from other sources. After completing further negotiations with any preferred candidates relative to salary, responsibilities or other matters of common concern, the provost or representative will meet with the Committee to discuss final action.
7. After the provost's decision has been made, the Committee will issue a final report to the Faculty Senate summarizing its activities, including the nature of the search (e.g., as above in A.3), the pool of final candidates, and the outcome of the process including the Committee's role, if any, in the final selection of the appointed candidate.
8. The Committee will continue to function until a selection is made or until it is relieved by the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee.
9. All searches must comply with the university's affirmative action and equal opportunity policies and procedures.

## **B. Composition of Faculty Search Committees**

1. Membership
  - a. For the provost position and Dean of University Libraries, the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee shall constitute an ad hoc Faculty Search Committee usually comprising not more than nine persons, including four full-time faculty members representing different colleges, elected at large by the college's full-time faculty, and three additional members appointed by the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee of which two should be senior faculty members in associate dean or dean positions. Effort should be made to assure representation on the committee from the various colleges. There shall be two voting student members, one an undergraduate nominated by the Student Government Association, the other a graduate student from the relevant college nominated by the Graduate Student Executive Board in consultation with the Graduate Student Senate.
  - b. With respect to vacancies in the position of academic dean or chair of newly created departments, the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee shall constitute an ad hoc Faculty Search Committee consisting of four full-time faculty members of the college

concerned, elected at large by the college's full-time faculty, and three additional members appointed by the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee of which one should be a senior faculty member from another college (which may be an academic dean). No more than one member may be elected or appointed from one department until every department in the college has one representative. There shall be two voting student members, one an undergraduate nominated by the Student Government Association, the other a graduate student from the relevant college nominated by the Graduate Student Executive Board in consultation with the Graduate Student Senate.

c. With respect to vacancies in the position of chair in existing departments, the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee shall constitute a Chair Search Committee of which, where practicable, at least one-half of the members are elected by the faculty of the department concerned, and the remainder appointed by the Senate Agenda Committee of which one should be a senior faculty member from another college (and may be a dean). Each Chair Search Committee shall develop appropriate mechanisms to assure meaningful student input regarding candidates. The Committee shall inform the Senate Agenda Committee of the mechanism(s) it has established.

2. The Faculty Senate Agenda Committee should consult with the provost before constituting any of the above-mentioned search committees. After constituting a search committee, the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee, in consultation with the provost, shall appoint a chair of the committee, charge the committee pursuant to A.2. above, and provide a timeline. In addition, close liaison with the provost should be maintained throughout the period of Committee operation to provide coordination, and make available budgetary and administrative support for the Committee's operations.

### C. Other Administrative Positions

Selection of administrators for positions other than those listed above will usually not involve establishment of a formal search committee, although in some instances this may be desirable. In instances where search committees seem advantageous, they will be constituted by the president or president designee, and may include, in addition to faculty, other administrators, students, alumni or professional persons outside the University, according to the special circumstances in each case.

Any interim appointment extending beyond twelve months must follow the procedures described in this module unless the term is explicitly extended by the provost for a maximum of twelve additional months.

### D. Administrator Evaluation Process<sup>4</sup>

1. Department chairs and equivalents (e.g., Directors and Group Chairs) and deans will be appointed for a term of no less than three years and no more than five years. Under normal circumstances, the term is five years and is eligible for renewal. A review will occur in the third year of the first five-year term. Additionally, administrators shall be reviewed early in the last year of their five-year term. When term length is less than five years (e.g., three-year term), the administrator will be reviewed in the last year of the term.
2. A. The provost or the provost's designee shall initiate administrator evaluations and, except as noted in 2B (below), shall have the discretion to determine the manner in which the review is conducted, who is involved, and the scope of the review.

**Commented [A2]:** The evaluation process has previously been recognized via Senate resolutions. The most recent was passed by the Faculty Senate, 30 January 2013 by a vote 31-0-0; approved by Provost Director 12 March 2013; BOT approval not required. This current version defines the timeline and report expectations more clearly and allows for online distribution of the final reports to the faculty in the department/college whose administrator was reviewed.

B. Once the provost or provost's designee commences an administrator evaluation, or at the discretion of the Senate Agenda Committee, the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee (AEOC) of the Faculty Senate will select an administrator review team composed of two or three full-time faculty members who will survey the full-time faculty served by the administrator being evaluated. The survey will address the administrator's leadership in matters of concern to the faculty.

The administrator review team will compile input from its survey, in a manner that both aggregates and anonymizes the input, and submit the report to the AEOC for editorial review. The report will objectively compile what the faculty have reported without qualitative judgments that may be negated by information that the administrator review team does not have available.

The AEOC will edit the report to expunge identifying references to the originator of specific comments and of personal references. Specifically, if there are matters in the report that the AEOC believes are of a highly personal or intimate nature, or that harass, threaten, defame, or slander the administrator, or make invidious reference to the administrator's race, religion, national origin, ethnicity, age, gender, marital status, sexual orientation, veteran status, genetic makeup, or disability ("improper comments"), the AEOC will edit the report in a manner that omits these matters or deals with them in an unobjectionable manner.

The AEOC will then send the report to the administrator being reviewed and to their supervisor. The administrator will have five business days to review the report in conjunction with their supervisor and request deletions of improper comments. The AEOC will consider these requests, with the legal assistance of an attorney from the Office of General Counsel, and will then make the appropriately redacted version available at the Faculty Senate Office, as specified below. The administrator review team's report will become part of the evaluation being prepared by the provost or provost's designee or will be submitted directly to the provost or the provost's designee.

A copy of the final version of the report shall be made available for review to all full-time faculty members within the unit, using a university-supported system that assures distribution only to the appropriate recipients.

If the AEOC has edited or deleted any materials, on its own or in response to a request from the administrator, that the AEOC believes raise questions of the propriety of the administrator's behavior, the AEOC will so inform the administrator's supervisor in order to permit the supervisor to initiate an appropriate investigation into these questions.

3. The Senate Agenda Committee, in consultation with the provost, will appoint an AEOC to implement the evaluation procedures. Its members will be chosen from the university at large, to be composed of three faculty members and two administrators. The AEOC will:
  - A. develop evaluation instruments in consultation with the Senate Agenda Committee;
  - B. appoint the faculty for each evaluation team, as described in section 2.B above;
  - C. schedule the sequencing of evaluations for individuals in units and provide each team with a reporting deadline;

D. review all reports from the administrator review teams, analyze the results for institutional patterns, and provide a report and recommendations to the Senate Agenda Committee, to the provost or appropriate vice president, and to the President;

E. suggest changes in the procedures and/or evaluation instruments, as deemed necessary.

#### 4. Evaluation of the Provost

The provost shall be evaluated on the same schedule as other administrators (1, above), or less if requested by the president, and be under the general oversight of the AEOC.

The report arising from the evaluation, once reviewed by the AEOC and expunged of identifying references to the originator of a specific comment(s) and of improper comments, shall be sent to the provost and to the president.

The provost will have five business days to review the report in conjunction with the president and request deletions of improper comments. The AEOC will consider any such requests, with the legal assistance of an attorney from the Office of the General Counsel, and will then make a copy of the appropriately redacted version available for review by all full-time members of the faculty, using a university-supported system that assures distribution only to the appropriate recipients.

<sup>4</sup> Adapted from the Administrator Evaluation Process resolution passed by the Faculty Senate, 30 January 2013 by a vote 31-0-0; approved by Provost Director 12 March 2013; BOT approval not required.