

Faculty Assembly Report

April 25, 2006

The Administrator Evaluation Committee finds itself at a point in its work in which it is requesting direction from members of the Faculty Assembly. Our charge has been difficult to implement for the campus for several reasons. One issue stems from an apparent difference of opinion on our direction from some members on Faculty Assembly, the wording of the by laws and the decisions made by the Administrator Evaluation committee to date. Senate by-laws describe the charge of the committee as that of administering an evaluation tool related to administrators' job performance and collecting and distributing that data. Specific methods for distribution and collection, as well as reporting, are not identified in the by-laws. Therefore, the committee is requesting that the implementation of the committee's charge be described in more detail for committee members, because previous descriptions of the process described at a recent Faculty Assembly meeting were not acceptable to some senators. That is one issue that needs clarification.

In a more global sense, however, we propose that the Faculty Assembly clarify, for itself, the purpose of the administrator evaluation process and procedures.. To that end, the committee wishes to contribute its approach and endorses the following positions:

1. The Committee values and supports the principle of a formal 360 evaluation process for campus administrators. The process should be fully integrated into the ongoing campus evaluation system that is established by the Chancellor's office. Rather than an "add on" evaluation procedure, the committee recommends that faculty's assessment should be carried out and considered an integral part of the evaluation provided through the process by which administrators' are regularly and systematically reviewed by their supervisors.
2. The purpose of the administrator evaluation process would be to provide evaluative input from faculty and staff members. Decisions made by administrators should be based upon data gathered in the evaluation process.

3. A culture of assessment should be created on campus. The feedback loop must be closed so that the faculty and staff become aware of the evaluative impact on each administrator. The administrators should have a vehicle or opportunity in which to reflect upon his/her feedback and acknowledge areas in which improvement is needed and of the strengths that exist.

4. The evaluation process should begin with a directive from the Chancellor's office and be carried out by it or a third party vendor.

5. The evaluation process should be linked to pertinent and accurate job descriptions and those evaluating the administrators should be aware (or made aware) of his/her responsibilities.

6. The Faculty Assembly Administrator Evaluation committee should operate as an advisory and oversight committee for the evaluation process and feedback gathered.

7. Rather than conducting the evaluation procedure itself, the committee would ensure the gathered data is submitted to the Provost's office on a timely basis. This would ensure that the faculty and staff's portion of the evaluation process is reported in a systematic manner, within the overall, existing, and campus evaluation process.

8. Ideally, an office or individual would be responsible for all campus assessment and evaluation procedures. This plan sends the message to the accreditation officers that the UM-St. Louis campus values the 360 evaluation process and actively seeks to create an assessment culture.

.