

University Senate of Michigan Technological University
Superseded for Presidential Evaluation

Proposal 22-94

University Senate Administrative Evaluation Procedure

In the natural evolution of a University, policies are developed and implemented for the purpose of improving the institution and the quality of education that it provides to its students. In order to ensure that this evolutionary process is effective, a means of periodically reviewing and evaluating administrative performance is required. Evaluation is fundamentally desirable because it provides feedback and voice from various university constituencies to the university administration. Regular evaluation encourages open communication, healthy interchange of information, and a shared sense of responsibility for university directions. The MTU Senate undertakes the responsibility for establishing a regular evaluation procedure for that segment of the University community which belongs in the Senate constituency. The procedure offers the Senate constituency the opportunity to evaluate the leadership (directions and implementation by upper administration) of the university as a whole. It is not an evaluation of supervisors by persons who work directly or indirectly under them.

Evaluation Procedure

(1) Frequency of Evaluation and List of Who Shall be Evaluated

The evaluation will begin at the end of the second full academic year for each new presidential administration. Evaluations will then be performed at four year intervals, or more often if deemed necessary by the MTU Senate.

Everyone whose title includes the following words shall be evaluated: President; Vice-President; Provost; Vice-Provost; Chief Financial Officer; or any other "Chief Officer." This list of titles shall be reviewed annually by the Senate Administrative Policy Committee and updated by said committee when necessary to include all upper administrators whose duties involve the university as a whole.

(2) Make-Up and Selection of an Evaluation Commission

Evaluations will be performed by a commission composed as follows:

College of Engineering 3 members

College of Science and Arts 3 members

School of Business 1 member

School of Forestry 1 member

School of Technology 1 member

Research Institutes 1 member

Library, Education &

Public Services and Non-Academic Groups (as defined in Senate Constitution) 1 member

External Representative 1 member

MTU Senate 1 member

This will provide for a thirteen member commission. The members of the commission are to represent the entire university community while they are serving, not just their individual

departments or academic units. If the organization of the university changes, the general principles for the composition of the commission are that colleges should have three representatives, schools shall have one representative, there shall be one external representative, and other members shall follow the model above to reflect the constituency list of the Senate. The member from the Senate will serve as the chairperson of the commission.

The method for selecting the members of the commission shall be as follows. In the colleges, each department nominates one person; in the schools, three people are nominated; each research institute nominates one person; and the library, education & public services, and the non-academic groups each nominate one person. The nominees shall be people who have tenure or if tenure is not available in their particular unit, they shall be people with at least three years of service. The external representative will be nominated by the Senate Administrative Policy Committee. Nominees for Senate representative will be solicited by the Senate Administrative Policy Committee. The MTU Senate (all constituent units voting) will vote to elect final Commission members, in accordance with the list above.

(3) General Evaluation Procedures to be Followed by the Commission

The following sequence of procedures shall be followed by the Evaluation Commission. The Commission can develop its own procedures, questions, and interpretations as long as they are not in conflict with the procedures contained herein.

1. The Commission shall gather relevant documentary evidence about university goals, directions, and plans, such as vision statements, five year plans, and other long-range plans. The relevant documentary evidence shall be determined by the Commission.
2. The Commission shall solicit self-evaluations from all persons being evaluated. These persons will be asked to document their performance and accomplishments. These self-evaluations may include, among other points, a summary of expectations or objectives held at the beginning of the evaluation period (the period since the last administrative evaluation or the beginning of term in the post) and statements about the degree to which the expectations were realized or the objectives accomplished. Factors which altered expectations and objectives, the mechanisms used to redefine objectives, and the degree to which the redefined objectives were obtained may also be included. Statements about major areas of institutional concern for the next evaluation period, changes which might be needed to address these concerns, and objectives to be achieved are also appropriate to be addressed in the self-evaluation.
3. The Commission shall compose and administer an evaluation questionnaire. This questionnaire shall be sent to all Senate constituents, as defined in the University Senate Constitution, Article II. The evaluation questionnaires shall be anonymous. The evaluation form should be constructed carefully. Ambiguous and loaded questions should be avoided. There should be no more questions than necessary to provide the information needed. The evaluation form shall include opportunities for respondents to give written comments as well as answering scaled questions. The Commission may seek advice from consultants and test the evaluation form before it is used. The evaluation form used in 1991 is contained in Appendix A.
4. The Commission may also conduct interviews or request information in whatever format befits the nature and sensitivity of the issues involved.
5. All written responses made in the questionnaire are to be anonymously transcribed. Descriptive statistics shall be aggregated from the questionnaires. All the above results shall be double-checked against the originals, and then the original questionnaires shall

be destroyed.

6. The Commission is charged with writing a report assessing how the University is doing as a whole, including the role of upper administrators in that matter, not simply reporting the results of a questionnaire or "popularity contest." The Commission shall use all the above sources of evidence and shall consider the relationship between goals, efforts, attainments, and redefined objectives. The final report shall include in its appendices the evaluation instrument, the tabulated responses, the complete transcribed anonymous written responses, and the complete self-evaluations. Commission drafts and minutes are confidential and shall be destroyed when the final report is released.
7. The final report of the Commission should be transmitted to the persons evaluated. They will be given the opportunity to include written responses as appendices to the final report.
8. Copies of the final report with appendices shall be submitted to the University Senate and the Board of Control. Copies with appendices shall be put on reserve at the Library and deposited in the MTU archives. Copies of the main text of the report and self-evaluations (but no other appendices) shall be distributed to all members of the Senate constituency.
9. The Commission should begin in September with the selection of Commission members. After the Commission has been formed, it will solicit self-evaluations by the persons being evaluated. The questionnaire, interviews, and all other information gathering should be completed by mid-December. The Commission report and responses should be submitted to the above parties by mid-March.

Authority

This policy supersedes Senate proposal 2-89.

Appendix

Questionnaire used by the 1991 Commission to Evaluate the Administration.

Adopted by Senate: May 1, 1994

Approved by President: May 11, 1994

See Proposal 42-04 for Evaluation of the President

Became Senate Procedures 501.1.1