

**UNIVERSITY SENATE  
UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY  
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

Introduced by:       Committee on Administrative Evaluations

Date:                 February 6, 2012

**AMENDMENT TO CREATE A COUNCIL ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND  
EVALUATION (CARE)**

Whereas the Middle States review pointed to a need for a more systematic administrative review;

Whereas the SUNY-wide Senate provides for Faculty-led review of administrative units on each campus;

Whereas half of SUNY campuses and two University Centers have introduced such mechanisms for regular administrative review;

Whereas the UAlbany Senate in April 2010 passed a resolution that the SEC explore setting up mechanisms for such review;

Whereas the SEC has referred this task to the Governance Council;

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BE ADOPTED:

- That a new **Council on Administrative Review and Evaluation (CARE)** be created.
- That this amendment shall go into effect in Fall 2012.

**RATIONALE**

Assessment and evaluation are fundamental to the work of any academic institution. The evaluation of administrators is a necessary part of the total assessment process since it greatly affects the teaching and learning that takes place and eventually finds its countenance in student success (Miller, Acebo, Fong, & Kanter, 1993). The formation of this Council is in direct response to the question of "institutional effectiveness" that was examined in the 2010 Middle States self-study process (<https://wiki.albany.edu/display/middlestates/Home>), where it was recommended that the University at Albany do a more systematic job of undertaking assessment of our various institutional functions: "...the campus should revisit the Institutional Assessment Plan, with particular emphasis on refocusing administrative unit assessments, as administrative unit assessments are largely uneven in coverage and application." And "...UAlbany should continue to enhance the processes associated with academic assessment

while increasing efforts towards more systematic and sustained assessment processes for administrative units” (p. 68). More specifically the Middle States Report recommends “The faculty, perhaps represented primarily by the University Senate, should be appropriately involved in the assessment of all University units, both academic and non-academic” (p. 12).

Moreover, according to the report by the Governance Committee of the SUNY University Senate (Governance Committee of the SUNY University Faculty Senate, 2005):

“The University Faculty Senate can take on an important role in affirming the importance of faculty evaluation of administrators by encouraging Campus Governance Leaders to revisit mechanisms for evaluation which may already be in place at their campuses, or where none exist, to examine the practices at those campuses which are successfully accomplishing this goal and, as necessary, adapt them to their own needs”(p. 5).

Finally, this amendment is in direct response to the Senate Resolution of April 2010 that such administrative review be explored for implementation at UAlbany and that the matter be referred to the Senate Executive Committee, who in turn referred it to the Governance Council.

The Council on Administrative Review and Evaluation (CARE) will be the Council of the Senate that is charged with the periodic review and timely evaluation of administrative performance. The amendment is shaped by the following observations from the *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators Report—SUNY wide Senate, 2005*:

- Evaluation of administrators by faculty works best when all parties involved consider it an attempt to improve the health and strength of the institution rather than targeting individuals.
- Administrators under review (although not always eager to embrace evaluation) accept it more readily when they perceive the processes are being administered fairly and that results are used to improve job performance.
- Because administrative evaluation is a sporadic process often performed by ad hoc committees monitored by frequently-shifting governance leadership it is important to ground the process in campus bylaws or a similar document and to make the process as streamlined and minimally onerous as possible (2005, p. 2).
- It is essential therefore, that there is a **written, mutually agreed on process in place.**

The evaluation process will be tailored to the individual position to the extent possible and conducted for the following primary purposes:

1. to reflect a commitment to shared governance as demonstrated by participation by all groups of individuals who work for or with the administrator;
2. to demonstrate a commitment to the mission, goals, institutional values and policies of the university, schools and/or colleges;
3. to be a responsible and responsive process that protects the rights and privacy of the administrator and the rights and privacy of those providing feedback;
4. to make the administrator and the supervisor aware of the perceptions of those who work directly with the administrator;
5. to result in a constructive evaluation designed to guide the professional development of the administrator;

6. to provide evidence and recognition of effective leadership;
7. to develop plans for improvement and innovation; and
8. to recognize outstanding performance, productivity and contributions to the university.

In keeping with these ideas, we propose that all administrative units be evaluated on a fixed rotating basis every five years, regardless of the length of tenure of the current Provost, Vice-President or Dean. This focuses the evaluation on the ongoing policies of the unit, rather than the current office holder; and it eliminates any perception that evaluations are arbitrarily triggered by special circumstances. It is our belief that feedback is needed, and that feedback can be of use to new or incoming deans/vice-presidents as well as to those with a long track record.

### **Works Cited**

- Governance Committee of the SUNY University Faculty Senate. (2005). *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators: SUNY*.
- Miller, S., D., Acebo, S. C., Fong, B., & Kanter, M. (1993). *Evaluating Administrators: Designing the process in a shared governance environment*. Paper presented at the "Leadership 2000" the 5th Annual International Conference of the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED361047&site=ehost-live>

## **Section XII: Council on Administrative Review and Evaluation.**

The Council on Administrative Review and Evaluation is created and charged with the evaluation of the Provost, all Deans, Vice-Presidents and their administrative units every five years.

### XII.1. Composition

XII.1.1. The Council shall consist of at least 6 but not more than 8 tenured Teaching Faculty, which shall include at least 3 from the uptown and 1 each from the downtown, CNSE and east campuses, from a balance of academic disciplines including the library, who shall serve two-year terms. The Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, & Effectiveness, or designee, *ex officio*, shall serve as a consultant to the Council and be a non-voting member.

XII.1.2. At least 1 and no more than 2 Professional Faculty with permanent appointment

XII.1.3. At least 3 of the Faculty (teaching or professional) must be Senators

XII.1.4. One graduate student who must be a Senator

XII.1.5. One undergraduate student who must be a Senator

XII.1.6. Two Management-Confidential personnel

XII.1.7. Staff support for the Council shall be designated by the President's office.

XII.1.8. The Chair of the Council must have the rank of Full Professor and be tenured., This includes members from the University Libraries who are the equivalent of Full Professor with tenure.

XII.1.9. The Chair shall be elected from among the Council members.

XII. 1.10. The members of CARE shall be nominated for Senate approval by the Committee on Council Nominations of the Governance Council.

### XII.2. Responsibilities

XII.2.1. The Council shall be responsible for developing campus policies, ensuring compliance with external policies, and considering other matters relating to administrative assessment.

XII.2.2. The Council shall be responsible for scheduling, coordinating and supervising the various cyclical reviews of Administrators, including Provost, Deans, Vice Presidents and their administrative units.

XII.2.3. The Council shall oversee the formation of Evaluation Committees for each of the individual administrative units (see the CARE: *Guidelines and Procedures* document for a complete listing).

## XII.2.4 Evaluation Committees

XII.2.4.1. The composition of the Evaluation Committees will vary according to the unit being evaluated, but each Evaluation Committee must include: a tenured Teaching Faculty member or tenured member from the University Libraries of CARE as its Chair and two additional CARE members, plus

XII.2.4.1.a for academic units reviewed, at least three tenured Teaching Faculty, as well as users of the services provided by the unit under review.

XII.2.4.1.b for non-Academic units, a minimum of three tenured Teaching Faculty, students or other users of the services provided by the unit.

XII.2.4.3. Evaluation Committees shall review the assessment instruments provided by CARE and may make recommendations to CARE for unit-specific criteria to be included in the assessment of their individual unit.

XII.2.4.4. The Evaluation Committees will be responsible for tabulating quantifiable results from the assessment instruments, identifying themes and compiling such themes in a report format that it will submit to CARE.

XII.2.5. The Council as a whole shall review the actions and assessment reports of its Evaluation Committees and shall be responsible for formally recommending that the University Senate accept an administrative assessment report.

XII.2.6. Based on findings from its Committees or its own deliberations, the Council may recommend policy changes to the University Senate and may recommend to the Executive Committee that it refer a question or issue to another Council.