

Agenda – Administrator Evaluation Committee – 11 May 2017

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

1. Committee Members

Barbara Cox, Marie-Christine Koop, Elliot Dubin, Bill Camp, Mike Spector, Christy Crutsinger; assisted by Jill Stover; Note that four committee members have their three-year terms expiring this year (Camp, Koop, Perez, and Spector)

2. Meetings held in 2016-2017

December 5, 2016; February 2, 2017; February 21, 2017; 3 April 2017 (minutes attached) with email exchanges about plans and actions before and after each of those meetings

3. Key Items Discussed

- a. Low response rates
- b. 360° evaluation of some administrators
- c. Inappropriate remarks on some forms
- d. Redaction of inappropriate responses
- e. Separation of the survey into two parts (Tier 1 = President, Provost, Deans and Chairs; Tier 2 = all others)
- f. Confidence/No-confidence question – yes/no vs. likert scale response
- g. Including the Ombudsperson
- h. Filling the committee openings

4. Actions Taken

- a. Request for the Provost to encourage faculty participation – declined to avoid potential appearance of bias
- b. Attempt to separate the evaluation into two tiers (Tier 1 = President, Provost, Deans, Associate Deans, and Chairs; Tier 2 = all others) – not done due to problems with implementing that in Qualtrics
- c. Confidence/No-confidence question – added for Tier 1 respondents in a yes/no form
- d. Included the ombudsperson
- e. Faculty Senate Executive Committee redacted inappropriate comments from 2016 responses that are still posted on the Faculty Senate website per committee's recommendation

5. Reflections

- a. The confidence/no-confidence question was useful – suggest moving it to the first response in the future for Tier 1 persons

- b. Response rates are still low and again there were a few instances of potentially inappropriate language
- c. Generally higher response rates for President, Provost, Deans and Chairs (summary attached)

6. Plans for 2017/2018

- a. Conduct Tier 2 evaluation survey in the Fall of 2017
- b. Conduct Tier 1 evaluation survey in the Spring of 2018
- c. Include the confidence/no-confidence question as the first question for all Tier 1 individuals
- d. Make it clear that the evaluation survey is:
 - i. Intended to be formative rather than punitive, so descriptive, non-personal remarks are much appreciated
 - ii. No persons other than the person being evaluated should be mentioned in the remarks
 - iii. Ask the Provost and Deans to encourage responses a week prior to the surveys
 - iv. Make it clear that supervisors use the responses in the context of continuous process improvement
 - v. Establish a process for a 360° evaluation and make a recommendation the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in the Fall of 2017; consider the following aspects of such an evaluation:
 - 1. Who – administrators in the second or third year of service
 - 2. What – discussions with those being evaluated by the committee or others recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (two interviewers present with each following a semi-structured interview protocol) along including requests for documented evidence of steps taken and/or planned to improve performance and productivity
 - vi. Consider again asking those being evaluated to post in a public place their reflections about their position, performance and productivity that might include, for example (this was requested two years ago with no follow-up):
 - 1. Short description of duties and responsibilities
 - 2. Short summary of positive actions taken with any evidence of outcomes
 - 3. Short reflection about selected evaluation remarks and/or areas in need of further or follow-up action
 - 4. Short statement of plans to improve in the near future.

Agenda/Notes– Administrator Evaluation Committee – 5 Dec 2016

Time and Location: 2 – 3:30 pm, Hurley 204A

1. Call to order and suggestions about the agenda (Spector)

Called to order at 2 pm by Mike Spector

In attendance: Barbara Bush, Jill Stover, Christy Crusting, Bill Camp, Jose Perez, Christine Koop, Mike Spector

2. Introductions around the table (all – with the unit involved)
3. Committee composition – open positions to be filled (Jill Stover)

4 persons have three-terms expiring in 2017 (Spector, Camp, Perez, Koop); Group 4 and 7 positions now open; Group 5 position awaiting confirmation

4. Schedule for this year's evaluation – finalize survey in February, administer in March (all)

The timing was a major item of discussion with the timing of administering the survey on April being the general consensus; the Faculty Senate procedures for this committee need to be updated to reflect a Spring survey which has occurred at least the last three years.

5. Broadening the effort based on Faculty Senate guidance (all)

- a. Ask for constructive feedback from administrators evaluated – e.g., steps already taken and plans to address selected concerns (logistics of doing this)
- b. Follow up with recommendations for a 360° evaluation with key administrators (e.g., President, Provost, Deans) – possibly with in-depth interviews or with an outside evaluator – likely to begin next academic year if recommended and approved

This topic was also discussed in detail with the outcome that the committee would make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate in the Spring of how a more in-depth review of key administrators might be conducted that is consistent with Policy 06.018 that Christy shared with the committee. Having key administrators post their self evaluations in a place accessible to those evaluating that administrator in response to item 2 in Procedures and Responsibilities of 06.018 prior to the survey might be helpful for all involved.

Another topic discussed was the typically low response rate on the online surveys. Returning to paper forms was discussed but not recommended. One idea about which there was general consensus was to the Provost and Deans to publicly encourage faculty to respond and indicate how those faculty evaluations were being used in accordance with university policy.

6. Avoiding disparaging comments in evaluations (Barbara Bush reports from Faculty Senate Executive Committee)
 - a. See suggested wording below in the draft cover email – how best to word that final paragraph (all)
 - b. What to do, if anything, about past disparaging comments in previous surveys (Perez)

Barbara Bush reported her consultations with the UNT attorney and EC and announced that the remarks had been removed and wording to avoid future occurrence was recommended.

7. Next meeting in January (all)
 - a. When to schedule – last week of January (to be determined)
 - b. Topics to address – finalize who to include in this year's evaluation, questions, and recommendations for a more extensive evaluation of key administrators periodically.
8. Review of actions items and adjourn

No action items other than recommendations indicated above. Meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Agenda/Notes – Administrator Evaluation Committee – 2 Feb 2017

Time and Location: 11:00-12:30 pm, Hurley 204A

1. Call to order and suggestions about the agenda (Spector) – 11:05 am

Those participating: Marie-Christine Koop, Bill Camp, Elliot Dubin, Jose Perez, Jill Stover, and Mike Spector. Four of those present are in their 3rd year and will inform their Senate representative or Dean (Camp, Koop, Perez and Spector).

2. Welcome to new committee member – Elliot Dubin
3. Reminder: Schedule for this year's evaluation – finalize survey in February, administer in March (all) – not discussed but in general aiming for a roll-out prior to Spring break
4. Review of planned questions

Discussed how to shorten the questions or possibly add one comment for each person/position evaluated and one additional question with a yes/no response – i.e., Do you have confidence in this person? Also ask what questions should be asked and who should be evaluated.

5. Review of those to be surveyed

Long discussion on this issue as the list is long and perhaps too long to increase faculty response rate, which remains a recurring goal. Keeping those in the position for 6 months or more and those retiring but still to serve in an administrative role was approved as in the past.

6. Next meeting in late Feb or early March to finalize the survey plan and take up remaining topics

When – probably last week of February to leave time to finalize and stay on schedule.

7. Review of actions items and adjourn

After much discussion, the committee voted to recommend only evaluating the President, Provost, Dean, Associate Deans and Department Chair as primary positions to be evaluated and ask the Faculty Senate the following:

- a. Add others (President's cabinet, Vice Provosts, and those not in the primary group) as an option to evaluate in an expanded survey at the end of the primary group;
 - b. Evaluate others in the Fall of 2017;
8. Have an IT person with Qualtrics experience attend the next meeting and then support Jill in creating the survey in whatever form is resolved at the next meeting.

REVISED Cover email from Faculty Senate for evaluation of administrators

REVISED February 2017

Subject: 2017 Evaluation of Administrators

Dear Faculty Members:

An important responsibility of faculty is the evaluation of administrators. Your feedback provides a necessary voice to ensure that administrators are responsive to faculty needs.

Below is a list of individual evaluation surveys. Every administrator on an interim or permanent position for at least six months, as well as those in their last year in the position, are subject to this review. **Please note that these evaluations are limited to administrators and is not intended for evaluation of faculty colleagues.**

Each administrator is evaluated separately. The individual survey of a particular administrator is accessed by clicking on the link provided below. Once an individual survey is completed, you must return to this e-mail to complete the next survey.

Surveys are available to you for two weeks from today, **March xx, until 5 p.m. Xxxxxday, April xx, 2017.** If you exit a survey before finishing it, then you only have one week to complete that survey. The system places a cookie on your browser to mark your progress. You will be able to return and complete the survey as long as you use **the same Internet browser and computer** that you used to first access the survey. If you have not completed the survey after a one-week period, only the responses that you have completed will be recorded.

The Faculty Senate and the Committee on the Evaluation of University Administrators strongly urges you to take this opportunity to make your voice heard through this anonymous process.

Please understand that comments are only available within UNT. Comments not pertinent to the position or person being evaluated may be removed if deemed inappropriate by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The focus is on the performance of the administrator being evaluated and not others. Together we can continually improve the quality of the administration at our University.

Sincerely,

J. Michael Spector, Chair
Committee on the Evaluation of University Administrators

NOTE: Depending on who will be evaluated and how (i.e., by adding an optional OTHER category with the remainder of those typically evaluated, wording will need to be added to reflect that change.

Agenda/Minutes – Administrator Evaluation Committee – 21 Feb 2017

Time and Location: 10:00-11:30 pm, Hurley 204A

1. Call to order and suggestions about the agenda (Spector) – 10:01 am

Those present: Marie-Christine Koop, Bill Camp, Christy Crutsinger, Elliot Dubin, Jill Stover, Mike Spector

2. Approving the agenda and around the table comments

Agenda approved

3. Reminders:

- a. Schedule for this year's evaluation – finalize survey in February, administer in March (all)
- b. Discussion with Christy Crutsinger (Spector)
 - i. Can implement a multiple-tiered in Qualtrics (Confirmed with Rose Baker who is looking for a graduate student to help)
- c. Meeting with Allen Clark about the survey (Spector)
 - i. Qualtrics – definitely feasible and support can be provided; consider doing two different surveys in the future with second tier administrators (cabinet, Vice Provosts, librarians, etc. – UNT ombudsman, per José) in the Fall and key administrators (President, Provost, Dean, Associate Deans, Chair) in the Spring; explained why the Chancellor had been previously included and did not think it necessary to continue doing that

4. How to proceed this year (all)

- a. Option A: have a multiple-tiered survey with the same questions, with key administrators appearing first, with a continue to other administrators question (yes/no) coming next and collect data on those wishing to continue to the second tier administrators and use those data a guide for subsequent surveys; keep questions as they have been.
- b. Option B: have a multiple-tiered survey with the same questions, with key administrators appearing first, with a continue to other administrators question (yes/no) coming next and collect data on those wishing to continue to the second tier administrators and use those data a guide for subsequent surveys; shorten some questions and add a confidence yes/no question to key administrators. [Option A/B is B with any changes to questions and only adding the yes/no confidence question for key administrators, and this was the consensus choice.]

- c. Option C: Only do key administrators this Spring with current questions and do other administrators in the Fall;
- d. Option D: Only do key administrators this Spring with modified questions and do other administrators in the Fall.
- e. Other options: none were proposed.

We voted to conduct the survey in the first two weeks of April this year, with reminders coming from the Provost and Faculty Senate and In-House the last week of March. Mike agreed to draft a note and share with Christy for the Provost. Email notices and reminders should have the words 'Evaluation of Administrators' in the subject line to ensure faculty do not ignore those notices. The emphasis this year is on improving the response rate and we will seek support from the Provost, Deans, and use In-House if possible to encourage faculty to respond.

We voted for option A/B – that is B with only the yes/no question added for key administrators but no modifications to existing questions, and using the two-tier approach and monitoring closely response rates to determine how best to proceed next year when there might be a serious restructuring of the survey.

We discussed whether or not we needed IRB approval and no one knew if that had been done in the past – not in the last three years – nor whether it was necessary. Mike agreed to check with IRB (request for clarification has already been sent to UNT IRB).

We discussed getting Qualtrics assistance for Jill who will meet with Elizabeth Vogt next week; Christy is checking with one person and Mike has a second person who might help; hopefully, whoever helps Jill will be appropriately reimbursed and/or recognized.

We also agreed not to evaluate the Chancellor at a previous meeting and agreed at this meeting not to evaluate Assistant Deans as most faculty had little detailed knowledge of those persons. We agreed to add the UNT Ombudsman to the group of second tier administrators to be evaluated and monitor the response rate per the request of some faculty.

5. If B or D is selected, then we need to gain consensus on how to modify questions. [NA]

6. Next meeting

To be scheduled the first week of April.

The next critical step prior to the next meeting is finalizing the survey in Qualtrics and coordinating advance notices from the Provost and Deans and possibly also using In-House.

7. Review of actions items and adjourn ; Adjourned at 10:35

Proposed Cover email from Faculty Senate for evaluation of administrators

REVISED February 2017

Subject: 2017 Evaluation of Administrators

Dear Faculty Members:

An important responsibility of faculty is the evaluation of administrators. Your feedback provides a necessary voice to ensure that administrators are responsive to faculty needs.

Below is a list of individual evaluation surveys. Every administrator on an interim or permanent position for at least six months, as well as those in their last year in the position, are subject to this review. This is a two part survey with key administrators (President, Provost, Dean, Associate Deans, Chair) first followed by an option to continue to other administrators (President's cabinet, Vice Provosts, Librarians, Ombudsman). **Please note that these evaluations are limited to administrators and is not intended for evaluation of faculty colleagues.** Each administrator is evaluated separately. The individual survey of a particular administrator is accessed by clicking on the link provided below.

Surveys are available to you for two weeks from **April 3rd, until midnight April 15th, 2017**. If you exit a survey before finishing it, then you only have one week to complete that survey. The system places a cookie on your browser to mark your progress. Identify of respondents is kept anonymous. You will be able to return and complete the survey as long as you use **the same Internet browser and computer** that you used to first access the survey. If you have not completed the survey after a one-week period, only the responses that you have completed will be recorded.

The Faculty Senate and the Committee on the Evaluation of University Administrators strongly urges you to take this opportunity to make your voice heard through this anonymous process.

Please understand that comments are only available within UNT. Comments not pertinent to the position or person being evaluated may be removed if deemed inappropriate by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The focus is on the performance of the administrator being evaluated and not others. Together we can continually improve the quality of the administration at our University.

Sincerely,

J. Michael Spector, Chair
Committee on the Evaluation of University Administrators

Agenda – Administrator Evaluation Committee – 3 Apr 2017

Time and Location: 12:00 – 1:30 pm, Hurley 204A

1. Call to order and suggestions about the agenda (Spector)

Participating: Barbara Cox, Marie-Christine Koop, Elliot Dubin, Bill Camp, Mike Spector, Jill Stover.

Regrets from Christy Crutsinger due to a conflicting obligation. Call to order at 1:05 pm

2. Approving the agenda and around the table comments

Added a discussion about increasing the response rate and addressing a 360° evaluation next year as recommended by Barbara Bus.

3. Reminders:

- a. Schedule for this year's evaluation – finalize and release today
- b. WE have to go with the traditional survey as it was not possible to do the two-tiered survey in qualtrics as planned

The survey with a slightly modified cover email goes out today. We agreed to modify the survey going to Dept. Chairs and remove their names as those to be evaluated, or if that was not easily done today, to simply ask Chairs not to evaluate themselves.

- c. Discuss any changes to the cover letter below

Minor edits were made to the letter already modified by Barbara Bush to correct a typo and remove the sentence about a two-part survey as that capability was not implemented as planned.

4. How to proceed this year (all)

- a. We decided that no additional meeting was needed this year although the committee should convene early in the Fall with new members and leadership.
- b. Send periodic reminders during the survey period to faculty to respond.
- c. Send a link to results once the survey responses have been tabulated and posted.
- d. Elliot Dubin was elected as the new [possibly interim] Chair to take over at the beginning of the Fall semester; nominated by Bill Camp, seconded by Barbara Cox, unanimous.
- e. Mike Spector recommended Dr. Rose Baker as a good replacement for him from Group II as she has worked with Jill Stover about Qualtrics and is quite adept at using Qualtrics (she agreed to accept a nomination to replace Spector).
- f. We recommended the following changes for the coming year:
 - i. Shorten the questions by about 50%.
 - ii. Again include the confidence/no-confidence question for the top tier administrators as is being done this year (President, Provost, Deans, Chairs).
 - iii. Fill all empty slots on the committee as soon as possible (Bill Camp, Jose Perez, Marie-Christine Koop, and Mike Spector have terms ending this year).

NAME	DEPARTMENT	TITLE/notes	# possible	2017	2016
Neal Smatresk	Office of the President	President	906	80	80
Thomas McCoy	Office of the President	Vice President for Research and Innovation	906	15	12
Bob Brown	Office of the President	Vice President for Finance and Administration, CPA	906	9	4
Shannon Goodman	Office of the President	Vice President for Enrollment	906	2	4
Elizabeth With	Office of the President	Vice President for Student Affairs	906	8	4
Deborah Leliaert	Office of the President	Vice President for University Relations and Planning	906	8	8
Joanne Woodard	Office of the President	Vice President for Institutional Equity and Diversity	906	10	5
David Wolf	Office of the President	Vice President for Advancement	906	6	2
Wren Baker	Office of the President	Vice President and Director of Athletics	906	4	na (10)
Finley Graves	Office of the President	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	906	46	55
Belinda Newman	Office of the President	UNT Ombuds	906	19	na
Christy Crutsinger	Office of the Provost	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs	906	29	25
Robert Watling	Office of the Provost	Vice Provost for Academic Resources	906	6	na
Brenda McCoy	Office of the Provost	Vice Provost for Academic Outreach	906	10	na
Victor Prybutok	Office of the Provost	Vice Provost of Toulouse Graduate School	906	27	na
Mike Simmons	Office of the Provost	Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs	906	5	na
Michael McPherson	Office of the Provost	Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Success	906	44	na
Patrick Pluscht	Office of the Provost	Vice Provost for Learning Enhancement	906	14	8
Amy Shenberger	Office of the Provost	Interim Vice Provost of International Affairs	906	10	na
Darlene Callahan	Office of the Provost	Space Management and Planning	906	8	5

Allen Clark	Finance/Administration	Associate Vice President for University Information Services	906	6	6
Philip Baczewski	Finance/Administration	Deputy CIO for UNT & Senior Director of Academic Computing and User Services- University Information Technology	906	5	7
Jason Simon	Finance/Administration	Associate Vice President, Data, Analytics, & Institutional Research	906		6
David Holdeman	CAS	Dean	278	48	26
Jean Schaake	CAS	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	278	22	12
Steve Cobb	CAS	Associate Dean for Administrative Affairs	278	31	15
Lisa Henry	CAS - Anthropology	Chair	9	2	3
Art Goven	CAS - Biological Sciences	Chair	38	8	2
Mike Richmond	CAS - Chemistry	Chair	19	4	3
Brian Richardson	CAS - Communication Studies	Chair	12	1	2
Lorenzo Garcia	CAS - Dance and Theatre	Chair	12	4	4
David Molina	CAS - Economics	Chair	14	9	2
Robert UpChurch	CAS - English	Chair	43	19	8
Paul Hudak	CAS - Geography and the Environment	Chair	13	4	4
Harold Tanner	CAS - History	Chair	31	11	7
Su Gao	CAS - Math	Chair	29	0	13
Eugene Martin	CAS - Media Arts	Chair	15	4	5
Doug Anderson	CAS - Philosophy and Religion	Chair	10	4	2
Michael Monticino	CAS - Physics	Interim Chair	22	4	7
Matthew Eshbaugh-Soha	CAS - Political Science	Chair	25	11	8
Vicki Campbell	CAS - Psychology	Chair	28	13	7
Daniel Rodeheaver	CAS - Sociology	Chair	10	8	6
Samuel Manickam	CAS - Spanish	Chair	17	12	0
Kim Campbell	CAS - Technical Communication	Chair	13	6	0
Marijn S. Kaplan	CAS - World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	Chair	15	14	9

Judith Forney	CMHT	Dean	27	12	16
Dee Knight	CMHT	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	27	10	11
Lisa Kennon	CMHT - Hospitality/Tourism Management	Interim Chair	16	5	8
Bugao Xu	CMHT - Merchandising/Digital Retailing	Chair	11	7	6
Marilyn Wiley	COB	Dean	92	21	17
Tracy Dietz	COB	Associate Dean for Assessment and Academic Reporting	92	14	2
Audhesh Paswan	COB	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	92	7	0
Terrance Pohlen	COB	Associate Dean for Operations and Research	92	11	3
Ananth Seetharaman	COB - Accounting	Chair	18	6	6
Marcia Staff	COB - Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law	Chair	17	0	1
Mary Jones	COB - Information Technology and Decision Sciences	Chair	20	9	6
Lew Taylor	COB - Management	Chair	19	7	11
new chair - no eval (Wes Randall)	COB - Marketing & Logistics	no chair to evaluate this year	18	0	5
Bertina Combes	COE	Interim Dean	128	19	9
Pam Harrell	COE	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Research	128	13	8
Lisbeth Dixon-Krauss	COE	Associate Dean for Educator Preparation Programs	128	7	5
Jan Holden	COE - Counseling and Higher Education	Chair	20	3	8
Abbas Tashakkori	COE - Educational Psychology	Chair	20	15	6
John Nauright	COE - Kinesiology, Health Promotion and Recreation	Chair	22	18	6
Jim Laney	COE - Teacher Education and Administration	Chair	28	10	11
Kinshuk	COI	Dean	38	10	0

Yunfei Du	COI	Academic Associate Dean (Interim)	38	8	0
Suliman Hawamdeh	COI - Information Science	Chair	17	5	6
Cathie Norris	COI - Learning Technologies	Chair	14	5	10
Patricia Cukor-Avila	COI - Linguistics	Interim Chair	7	1	3
Greg Watts	CVAD	Dean	49	23	7
Denise Baxter	CVAD	Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs	49	16	8
Eric Ligon	CVAD	Associate Dean of Administrative Affairs	49	12	9
Kelly Donahue-Wallace	CVAD - Art Education/Art History	Chair	12	3	7
Cynthia Mohr	CVAD - Design	Chair	15	2	1
Robert Jessup	CVAD - Studio Art	Chair	22	5	11
Constantinos (Costas) Tsatsoulis	ENG	Dean	77	19	16
Nandika D'Souza	ENG	Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies	77	10	8
Yan Huang	ENG	Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies	77	8	9
Vijay Vaidyanathan	ENG - Biomedical Engineering	Chair	2	1	0
Barrett Bryant	ENG - Computer Science and Engineering	Chair	28	11	12
Shengli Fu	ENG - Electrical Engineering	Chair	9	5	0
Enrique Barbieri	ENG - Engineering Technology	Chair	14	7	5
Andrey Voevodin	ENG - Materials Science and Engineering	Chair	16	6	4
Kuruvilla John	ENG - Mechanical and Energy Engineering	Chair	8	0	3
Glenisson de Oliveira	Honors College and TAMS	Dean	906	5	2
James Duban	Honors College and TAMS	Academic Associate Dean2	906	8	6
Eric Gruver	Honors College and TAMS	Academic Associate Dean	906	2	0
James Mueller	JOUR	Chair/ Interim Faculty Director	17	4	8
Dorothy Bland	JOUR	Dean	17	7	11

John Richmond	MUSIC -	Dean	98	16	0
Warren Henry	MUSIC -	Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	98	18	0
Jon Nelson	MUSIC -	Associate Dean for Operations	98	14	10
Joseph Klein	MUSIC - Composition Studies	Chair (FDL spring 2017)	4	1	1
Richard Sparks	MUSIC - Conducting and Ensembles	Chair	8	0	1
John Holt	MUSIC - Instrumental Studies	Chair	34	8	6
John Murphy	MUSIC - Jazz Studies	Chair	12	4	5
Steven Harlos	MUSIC - Keyboard Studies	Chair	8	1	4
Debbie Rohwer	MUSIC - Music Education	Chair	6	1	3
Frank Heidlberger	MUSIC - Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology	Chair	19	5	11
Steve Austin	MUSIC - Vocal Studies	Chair - FDL spring 2017	7	3	6
Nicole Dash	HPS	Academic Associate Dean	52	8	6
Ernest Moore	HPS - Speech & Hearing Sciences	Chair (stepping down end of the year)	14	1	7
Jesus Rosales-Ruiz	HPS - Behavior Analysis	Chair	5	3	4
Celia Williamson	HPS - Community and Professional Programs	Interim Chair	6	0	3
Eric Fritsch	HPS - Criminal Justice	Chair	11	7	7
Linda Holloway	HPS - Disability and Addiction Rehabilitation (includes Gerontology)	Chair	12	5	3
Gary Webb	HPS - Emergency Management and Disaster Science	Chair	4	2	0
Abraham Benavides	HPS - Public Administration	Chair	7	2	5
Martin Halbert	University Libraries	Dean (returning to faculty at end of year)	50	10	26
Sue Parks	University Libraries	Associate Dean for Special Libraries	50	8	7
Mark Phillips	University Libraries	Associate Dean for Digital Libraries	50	5	5
Sian Brannon	University Libraries	Associate Dean for Collection Management	50	9	14

Joseph Oppong	Toulouse Graduate School	Academic Associate Vice Provost	906	17	13

Notes – Administrator Evaluation Chair Meeting with Faculty Senate Executive Committee – 31 May 2017

Time and Location: 1:30 – 1:40 pm, Hurley 204

1. Addendum to the committee’s annual report:
 - a. Elliot Dubin was elected interim chair of the committee effective 1 Sep 2017 as reported in the 3 April meeting notes; when the full committee convenes in the Fall, an election of the chair for 2017/2018 will be conducted by the committee.
2. Two main topics were briefly discussed at the meeting today:
 - a. Plans for the coming year:
 - i. The two tiered approach will be attempted this coming year; The confidence/no-confidence question will be moved to the first item for each Tier 1 person being evaluated;
 - ii. A plan for a 360° evaluation of selected administrators in their second or third year will be developed and submitted by the committee to the Faculty Senate for approval, as indicated in the annual report.
 - b. How to deal with possibly objectional remarks in this year’s evaluation:
 - i. Two kinds of remarks were discussed – those disparaging remarks which also named individuals other than the person being evaluated, and remarks which seemed somewhat inflammatory and inappropriate in an evaluation survey;
 - ii. The general discussion focused on to what extent censoring or redacting comments was desirable and there seemed to be an inclination to have as little censoring and redaction as possible; the one case from last year involved very disparaging remarks about faculty not associated with the person being evaluated, and university counsel indicated that such remarks could be removed without legal complications;

- iii. Stressing the use of the evaluation in a formative manner seemed acceptable and one suggestion was to have meetings with faculty in their departments and colleges prior to the survey indicating the purpose, importance and kinds of remarks that would be helpful urging faculty to avoid inflammatory language; a second suggestion was to consider changing the nature of the questions in a way that would be more likely to elicit specific and constructive feedback, even when it is somewhat negative.

The time allocated for the discussion expired and the committee chair was invited back to the next meeting of Executive Committee.

- iv.
- v. Find a Qualtrics expert to assist Jill Stover with a new survey in the Fall.
- vi. Implement two separate surveys in the fall with Tier-two in the Fall and Tier-one (top tier) in the Spring.
- vii. Develop a 360° survey for administrators in their second or third year of service that includes interviews and a review of their specific accomplishments and a self-assessment.
- viii. Request that those being evaluated complete a self-assessment that addresses accomplishments, plans going forward, and areas in need of emphasis or improvement; ask that these assessments be posted in a place where they are easily accessible to faculty.
- ix. Consider some kind of incentive for responding to next year's survey – for example, a drawing of 10 to 20 items available at the University bookstore available to all who complete the survey (this may jeopardize the anonymity of the survey and may not be allowed by university rules and regulations, so this is just a suggestion of one way to increase the response rate.

5. Review of actions items and adjourn

- a. Mike agreed to ask the Provost to send an encouraging reminder to respond to the survey.
- b. Jill agreed to see if the Chair surveys could easily be modified to remove their names from those being evaluated; if no, the survey will go forward as it has in the past with the possibility of chairs evaluating themselves.
- c. Mike will meet with Jill after the survey ends to get data on response rates to share with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on April 26th.
- d. Bill Camp moved to adjourn and seconded by Barbara Cox at 1:46 pm