DRAFT – January 31, 2017

Assessment of Administrative Units - - -Issues for discussion:

1. Constitute a separate standing body or partner with the University Senate to assess the assessment of administrative units?

    a. See pages 2-3, for a description of a potential campus-wide assessment committee that would be constituted with governance consultation and representation - OR

    b. Request that the University Senate ask one of its councils (current or new) to perform this function.

2. Should we provide separate suggested outlines for Dean's Offices versus administrative units under the vice presidents? Need to consult with the deans on this.

    For example, in addition to the self-study outline above, ask Deans' offices to specifically address their major functions:

    1. Academic policies
        a. Handling disruptive behavior in the classroom
        b. Policy on absence of instructors from class
        c. Student academic grievance procedures
        d. Syllabus requirements
        e. Syllabus storage policy
        f. Standards of academic integrity
        g. Undergraduate regulations
    2. Support for faculty development in teaching, research and scholarly/creative, activities
        a. Travel policies
        b. Instructional workload policies
        c. Policies on course leaves, buy-outs, and usage trends
    3. Personnel administration
        a. Tenure and promotion
        b. Faculty (and staff) hiring
        c. Faculty mentoring program(s)
        d. Diversity initiatives
    4. Budget development and execution
    5. Facilities management
    6. Fostering public and community service
    7. General support services
    8. Other…

    We can start small in year 1, and develop the items to cover as we progress. Senate colleagues may have useful input on this.

    Suggestion from Dean Wulfert -

    On a more general level, I think a different way to conduct a review would be to (1) establish *functional units* that will be reviewed and then (2) per rubric to develop policies and procedures by which to measure unit effectiveness, set benchmarks (compare with peers, etc.).

    For the schools and colleges' functional units, I would suggest:

Assessment of Administrative Units - - -Issues for discussion:
(a) Academic administration (e.g, course scheduling, advisement, online learning, internships, etc. etc.)
(b) Financial administration (e.g., budget, part-time resources, etc.)
(c) Personnel administration (e.g., term renewals and T&P process, grievances, faculty development, etc.)
(d) Research administration (e.g., grants, ICR usage, research support for faculty, instrumentation, etc.)
(e) Facilities administration (e.g., space usage, distribution, management – labs, offices, etc.)
(f) Community engagement (e.g., internships, applied learning, applied research, etc.)

These are just some ideas. For each of these rubrics, I would first create a framework that could be fleshed out and create sub-categories, and I would go about it in a more empirical fashion. For example, for the first bullet, (a) academic administration, I would get the assistant and associate deans of all schools and colleges together and have them lay out the day-to-day administrative processes and procedures they use. (These are the people in the trenches and based on their work one could quickly develop important areas that an efficient academic unit would cover and that should be assessed. The same approach can be used with the other rubrics: e.g., for financial admin one could gather the financial managers of the schools and colleges and someone from the Budget office).

3. Should we bring in external reviewers? If so, who pays? Need guidelines. This might work for some administrative units, but would be difficult for others, like Deans' offices.

Assessment of Administrative Units - - -Issues for discussion:
The administrative unit assessments might be reviewed by an Assessment Advisory Committee – need to modify the Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP) to reflect this. [The IAP currently describes the Provost's Assessment Advisory Committee, brought together in 2004, but has not met since 2006, or so]. See http://www.albany.edu/assessment/iap.html for the IAP.

Or could report the assessments to a Senate body.

If an Assessment Advisory Committee, this could be an advisory body to the president, vice presidents, and deans, and could have Senate representation. This body would be charged with ensuring that University at Albany policies, procedures, and guidelines regarding assessment-related activities meet internal needs and external mandates.

The Advisory Committee's general roles include:

1. Identifying when and where financial and administrative support is needed to support and advance assessment on the campus,

2. Advocating assessment and committing to the implementation of a culture of assessment on the campus, and

3. Familiarizing its members with Middle States accreditation standards, particularly new standards 6 (Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement) and 7 (Governance, Leadership, and Administration)

The Advisory Committee's charge can be broken down into three goals that will shape its future agenda:

- **Goal 1:** Periodically reviewing and updating the Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP).

- **Goal 2:** Working with the vice presidents, deans, and faculty governance to create organizational structures to implement and support assessment across the campus by:

    1. Prompting each unit to identify its mission, goals, and objectives within the framework of institutional and divisional mission,

    2. Assisting units in determining how to measure whether their goals and objectives are being achieved and how to use evaluative measures to improve services and processes,

    3. Developing linkages between the assessment process and planning and resource allocation functions, and

    4. Aiding units to document these processes of evaluation and improvement.

- **Goal 3:** By virtue of goals 1 and 2, the Assessment Advisory Committee will play a significant role in positioning the University to comply with the Middle States

Assessment of Administrative Units - - -Issues for discussion:

Commission on Higher Education's (MSCHE) accreditation standards. This committee could also play a major role in steering the 2020 MSCHE Self-Study Report.

The Assessment Advisory Committee shall include representatives of the following University constituencies:

Provost's Office:
Co-chair - Assistant Vice Provost for Academic & Resource Planning (IRPE)
Vice Provost for Administration

Governance and Faculty/Staff:
University Planning and Policy Council (UPPC)
Council on Academic Assessment (CAA)
Governance Council (GOV)

Vice Presidential Divisions:
Co-chair - Student Affairs Coordinator, Student Learning & Assessment
Information Technology Services
Finance & Administration

Deans:
Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Education
Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education

Three-year Rotating Membership, starting with the following
Rockefeller College (1 year initially)
School of Business (2 years initially)
College of Arts and Sciences (3 years initially)

Students:
Undergraduate – Student Association President or designee
Graduate – Graduate Student Association President or designee

Staff: Associate Director of Assessment

The Assessment Advisory Committee will be asked to:

1. Prepare an inventory of proposed administrative unit assessment metrics to assess overall institutional effectiveness and unit contributions to overall institutional effectiveness.

2. Help to identify and disseminate assessment best practices.

3. Maintain a Web site making assessment resources available to faculty and staff.

4. Maintain a library of campus assessment documents to be used in the preparation of summary reports for Middle States, site visits, and for internal departmental use.

Assessment of Administrative Units - - -Issues for discussion:

5. Assist the vice presidential divisions and their units, and the schools/colleges in organizing and implementing assessments of administrative effectiveness as related to achieving institutional strategic goals.