Guidelines and Procedures for the Council on Administrative Review and Evaluation (CARE)

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish procedures that 1) are pertinent to institutional effectiveness as it affects the predominant faculty/staff and student interests in learning and research; 2) provide opportunities for the institutional unit being reviewed to submit information appropriate for the assessment of the unit's performance; 3) provide an opportunity for the institutional unit to comment on the final report of CARE; 4) maximize opportunities for faculty/staff and stakeholders' participation in the process; and 5) provide an unambiguous expression of faculty/staff judgment of the performance of the institutional unit in question as well as the rationale for that judgment. It is understood that they will evolve as successive Councils learn from the experience of conducting evaluations.

The Guidelines are 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.***

At its first Council meeting in the spring, CARE shall elect a Chair, who shall contact the President (or designee) to learn the next year's review schedule (see Attachment A).

The Council will collaborate with the administration and faculty/staff to develop the procedures for the assessment of institutional units. CARE's role relates primarily to developing the questionnaire, in conjunction with the administration, for the faculty/staff evaluation for each administrative unit. CARE may also make suggestions on the other assessment structures based on available models (e.g. Andras, 2011, Corresponding et al., 2005 …etc.) as well as the findings and recommendations of the University at Albany's Course Assessment Advisory Committee (Course Assessment Advisory Committee, 2012).

CARE may borrow from what has been used by other institutions and customize the instruments to assess the specific institutional unit being reviewed as is appropriate to the conditions at the University at Albany. There is a fairly extensive literature on assessment of institutional units (e.g. Banta, 2007, Blackburn & Jo Clark, 1975…etc.) Furthermore, this review process has been done by a number of colleges and universities (Administrative Review Committee of the University Senate Stony Brook University, 2003; Binghamton University Faculty Senate Executive Committee, 2004; Governance Committee of the SUNY University

CARE: Guidelines and Procedures

Faculty Senate, 2005).There is also the COACHE (Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education) survey from Harvard University as well as the survey instrument adapted from Miller et al. (1993).

With these observations in mind, the following procedures are proposed:

1. In the spring or summer of each year the Chair requests documentation from the institutional units that the administration has scheduled to be assessed.

2. In the first fall meeting CARE will form Evaluation Committees for each of the units being assessed. Each Evaluation Committee will be composed with two or three members from CARE, one of whom shall be appointed Chair by CARE. In reviewing an academic unit the Council of the School or College will nominate other faculty members who will then be approved by CARE. College Councils should avoid selecting department chairs who are directly supervised by an administrator who heads the unit they are to review (if possible). If there is no active College Council in the School or College, CARE will form the Evaluation Committee with input from the Senators from that unit. At least one undergraduate but not more than three and at least one but not more than three graduate students will also be appointed.

3. In evaluating institutional units headed by Vice-Presidents, CARE will nominate teaching and professional faculty in consultation with the unit under review. At least one undergraduate and graduate student shall also be appointed, although more might be appropriate for committees reviewing units with a high degree of student usage, i.e., the Office of the Vice-President for Student Success.

4. After the questionnaire is agreed upon with administration, IR will administer the survey to the faculty/staff and student users of the institutional unit, and forward the responses (or tabulated electronic responses and all written responses) to the Evaluation Committee.

5. The Evaluation Committee will compile all materials into an Evaluation Report, which will contain a:

   a. summary of the process used to generate the report,

   b. summary of all submitted materials from the institutional unit and outside reviewers (if used by the administration),

   c. tabulation of quantifiable results,

   d. summary of written comments of users, identifying themes contained therein.

6. The final CARE Evaluation Report **will not include specific references to departments, subunits, or individual writers.** When it includes quotations from written comments, the writer's anonymity will be protected. All such primary materials will remain confidential and be destroyed after the Senate considers the report.

7. The Evaluation Committee report will be forwarded to CARE, which will review and edit it before sending the draft to the institutional unit being reviewed for comments and

feedback. These comments will be included as an appendix to the final Evaluation Report.

8. CARE will review the report (with the institutional unit's comments if any are provided) and make a decision to either accept the report and send it on to the Senate via the Senate Executive Committee, or to send it back to the Evaluation Committee for further clarification before considering it for acceptance.

9. Final submission to the SEC/Senate has a target date of the end of the academic year for consideration by the Senate at the first fall meeting. Given the need for local practice and negotiation in determining the dissemination of research results (SUNY Senate, *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators*, 2005, p. 5), we leave open which results may be restricted to the unit concerned and their immediate supervisor, and which results may be made more widely available. The Senate Leadership, together with CARE, will determine this issue on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration communications from administration on the matter.

10. The final CARE report will be presented to the President and to the institutional unit assessed.

Nature of Respondent Groups

The Evaluation Committee shall work with the institutional unit and administration to develop a broad-based, sufficiently large and representative group of potential responders who are familiar with the work of the unit. Responses, including written comments, shall be actively sought from students, faculty and professional staff.

Responsibility of Participants

All participants in the process of administrative assessment are to respect the confidentiality of the process; nothing can be used or reported without the permission of the units. .

Confidentiality/Anonymity

Confidentiality is defined as the right of the individuals who provide information and assessment to an Evaluation Committee, not to be required to identify who they are. It is the responsibility of the Evaluation Committee and CARE to ensure that the confidentiality of all respondents is maintained throughout the process. Under no circumstances (except legal mandate) will anyone other than members of the Evaluation Committee or CARE be allowed to examine raw data in questionnaires, letters, or interviews, and no copies may be made. All such primary materials will remain confidential and shall be destroyed after the Senate considers the report.

Self-Evaluations

Where feasible, Evaluation Committees will solicit self-assessment materials from units being reviewed. Systematic assessment is an iterative process. Representatives from the

CARE: Guidelines and Procedures
institutional unit should meet with the Evaluation Committee at least once toward the end of the review process to discuss the content of the final report, and have an opportunity to append additional comments to the original self-assessment. The final self-assessment should include a plan indicating benchmarks for future growth and development that can be assessed when the institutional unit is next reviewed.

Bibliography

Administrative Review Committee of the University Senate Stony Brook University. (2003). *Summary of Responses to Tenth Senate Survey*. Retrieved from Stony Brook:

Andras, P. (2011). Research: metrics, quality, and management implications. *Research Evaluation, 20*(2), 90-106. doi:10.3152/095820211x12941371876265;

Banta, T. W. (2007). Can Assessment for Accountability Complement Assessment for Improvement? *Peer Review, 9*(2), 9-12. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=25975835&site=ehost -live

Binghamton University Faculty Senate Executive Committee. (2004). *Faculty Senate Evaluation Coordinating Committee: Guidelines and Suggested Procedures for the ECC*. Retrieved from Binghamton, New York:

Blackburn, R. T., & Jo Clark, M. (1975). An Assessment of Faculty Performance: Some Correlates Between Administrator, Colleague, Student and Self-Ratings. *Sociology of Education, 48*(2), 242-256. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=13008342&site=ehost -live

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2008). Tensions in Higher Education Leadership: Towards a Multi-Level Model of Leadership Practice. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 358-376. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00398.x

Bosco, J. (1971). The role of the administrator in the improvement of evaulation studies. *Education, 92*(2), 70. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=4723314&site=ehost-live

Corresponding, M. W., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 27*(2), 227-238.

Course Assessment Advisory Committee. (2012). *Report of the Course Assessment Advisory Committee*. Retrieved from Albany, NY:

Don, E. G. (1977). Five Evaluation Frameworks: Implications for Decision Making in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 48*(5), 571-593. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1981598

Douglas, K., & Voy, S. A. L. (2002). The Campus Assessment Working Group: A Collaborative approach to meeting escalating assessment needs in higher education. *Assessment Update, 14*(3), 1. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10349976&site=ehost -live

Engel, M. (1984). Ideology and the Politics of Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 55*(1), 19-34. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1980970

CARE: Guidelines and Procedures

Fenker, R. M. (1975). The Evaluation of University Faculty and Administrators: A Case Study. *The Journal of Higher Education, 46*(6), 665-686. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1979061

Gable, R. W., & Springer, J. F. (1979). Evaluating development programs: Administrative self-assessment in four Asian nations *Studies in Comparative International Development, 14*(3/4), 63. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7100138&site=ehost-live

Gardiner, L. F. (nd). Assessment and evaluation in higher education: Some concepts and principles. Retrieved from http://www.thenationalacademy.org/readings/assessandeval.html

Governance Committee of the SUNY University Faculty Senate. (2005). *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators.* Retrieved from http://www.suny.edu/facultySenate/Publications.cfm

Hadden, C., & Davies, T. G. (2002). From innovation to institutionalization: The role of administrative leadership in the assessment process. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 26*(3), 243-260. doi:10.1080/106689202317245446

Heck, R. H., Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2000). Administrative effectiveness in higher education: Improving assessment procedures. *Research in Higher Education, 41*(6), 663-684. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=3892694&site=ehost-live

Hodgson, K., & Whalley, G. (2007). The effectiveness of a university's administration of its learning and teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(2), 275-279. doi:10.1080/13562510701192107

House, E. R. (1974). The Politics of Evaluation in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 45*(8), 618-627. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1980729

Kotler, P., & Murphy, P. E. (1981). Strategic Planning for Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 52*(5), 470-489. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1981836

London, C. (2011). Measuring how the head of department measures up: development of an evaluation framework for the head of department role. *Quality in Higher Education, 17*(1), 37-51. doi:10.1080/13538322.2011.554314

Martinez, M. C. (2002). Understanding State Higher Education Systems: Applying a New Framework. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(3), 349-374. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1558461

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, Washington, DC. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED361047&site=ehost-live

Siddique, A., Aslam, H. D., Khan, M., & Fatima, U. (2011). Impact of academic leadership on faculty's motivation and organizational effectiveness in higher education system. *International Journal of Academic Research, 3*(3), 730-737. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=69707666&site=ehost-live

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior : a study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

CARE: Guidelines and Procedures

Welsh, J. F., & Metcalf, J. (2003). Faculty and Administrative Support for Institutional
Effectiveness Activities: A Bridge across the Chasm? *The Journal of Higher Education, 74*(4), 445-468. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3648245

Attachment A   - Units to be assessed and rotating year of review:

Units under the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, etc. (3)

Units of the Vice-President for Research (1)

Units of the VP for Student Success (1)

Units of the VP for Athletic Administration (2)

Units of the VP for Finance and Business (4)

Units of the VP for University Development (3)

Units of the VP Communications and Marketing (5)

Units of the Chief Information Officer (2)

Units of the President (4)

Units of the College of Arts and Sciences (2)

Units of the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences (4)

Units of the School of Business (1)

Units of the School of Education (2)

Units of the College of Emergency Preparedness, Homeland Security and Cybersecurity (3)

Units of the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs (4)

Units of the School of Criminal Justice (1)

Units of the School of Social Welfare (5)

Units of the School of Public Health (5)

Units of the University Libraries (5)

CARE: Guidelines and Procedures

Table 1: Schedule of Units to be reviewed

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
VP Research	VP Athletics	VP Academics	VP Finance & Business	VP Communication & Marketing
VP Student Success	CIO	VP Univ Development	President's Direct Reports	School of Social Welfare
School of Criminal Justice	College of Arts & Sciences	CEHC	College of Engineering and Applied Sciences	School of Public Health
School of Business	School of Education		Rockefeller College	University Libraries