



University Senate
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC)

**Response to Charge A-0812B: Evaluation of Administrators
Part II: Evaluation of Upper Administrators: University President**

A. Charge

A-0812B: Evaluation of Administrators, Part II: Evaluation of Upper Administrators: University President. Given the potential joint Rutgers-UMDNJ integration and changes in administrative structure, reconsider the process recommended by the University Senate in 2012 for evaluation of upper administrators, including the University President, Chancellors, and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The FPAC received permission from the Senate Executive Committee to further narrow the charge, so that this Report pertains only to the University President.

B. Summary

As discussed below, the FPAC makes the following recommendations:

- To formulate the evaluation of the President so that it provides input to a comprehensive, periodic evaluation of the President by the Board of Governors.
- To ask the University Senate to strongly affirm a previous recommendation to the Board of Governors to institute a periodic evaluation of the University president, to which this University-wide evaluation serves to inform.

C. Background

The procedure for the evaluation of upper administrators by faculty, staff, and students was adopted by the University Senate in March 2012.¹ This policy was based on a decanal review process which had already undergone two revisions since it was implemented, the major goal of which was to “provide input to the supervising administrator of the reviewee as to his/her performance.” At the time the report was issued, the Upper Administrators for which these policies were formulated included the University President, the Chancellors of Camden and Newark, and the Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs (EVPAA), who at the time also served in a broader capacity as Chancellor of New

¹ [Response to Charge A-0812A, Part 2, Evaluation of Upper Administration](#) - Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee - March 2012.

Brunswick albeit without such a formal title. Since then, significant changes to University structure have been underway, as pointed out in Interim President Richard Edward's August 8, 2012 response to the Senate report:

"As you know, the university is in a stage of considerable transition. Dr. Robert L. Barchi will assume the Rutgers presidency effective September 1, 2012. In addition, the New Jersey Medical and Health Sciences Education Restructuring Act, which awaits approval by Gov. Christie and our governing boards, would significantly restructure the university and includes provisions to create several new high-level administrative positions. Given the unknown implications of both of these changes on the university's administrative structure, I do not support the adoption of a new and significant evaluation procedure for upper administrators at this time. "

Given these pending changes in administrative structure, the FPAC opted in October, 2012 to reconsider the evaluation process recommended by the University Senate earlier that year and asked the Executive Committee of the Senate to issue a new charge. Since the committee deemed that the roles and reporting relationships of Chancellors and the EVPAA will remain unclear for the foreseeable future, the committee chose to separate the part of the charge that addressed the evaluation of the University President from policy to be reformulated for the evaluation of the other upper administrators. This is the object of the current report.

C.1. Peer Institution Policies and Rutgers History: the current decanal policy extended to upper administrators

Assessment and evaluation are the catch words of the 21st century and the number of public colleges and universities doing annual reviews of their presidents jumped from 66 to 92 percent over the last decade, according to a 2008 survey by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). Nearly 53 percent of public colleges say they are also doing more in-depth, comprehensive assessments of their presidents every three to five years, according to the survey.

Several of our peer institutions have policies of periodic evaluations of their presidents but the method and availability of the resultant report varies widely from a completely confidential regents-only evaluation (Maryland²) to a 360° university community evaluation with the results appearing on the web (University of Michigan-Ann Arbor³). Outside consultants may be utilized and surveys may be one of the instruments of evaluation, albeit not the only one, in the policies of several institutions⁴.

The FPAC decided not to recommend a policy of evaluation as radical as the one in Ann-Arbor, even if

² The Chancellor of the University System of Maryland appoints a review committee to evaluate the Presidents of the Universities in the system. The committee then submits its report to the Chancellor. The report remains confidential and becomes part of the president's personnel file.

³ The University of Michigan-Ann Arbor Faculty Senate conducted a precedent-setting campus-wide evaluation of academic administrators during December 2004, which has now been carried out on an annual basis. The results are made available online, including the evaluation of the President. In 2004 a specially created standing committee constructed an on-line evaluation system, which consisted of electronic questionnaires and specially tailored software and information systems. Once this had been carried out, it was used for subsequent years without need for a newly created system.

⁴ At the University of Washington the board of regents performs confidential annual evaluation of the President with the help of an outside consultant who conducts a survey, oversees the process, and prepares the report.

that is an institution to which Rutgers aspires. The culture at Rutgers, built from the decanal evaluations, is for the report to remain confidential and for a summary to be disseminated. We also agree with the AGB that such evaluations should be carried out by the Governing Board. The role of shared governance in these evaluations would then be to provide input to a comprehensive periodic evaluation to the Rutgers Board of Governors (BoG). The FPAC and the University senate urge the BoG to institute such a periodic comprehensive evaluation but do not presume that it will do so. Nevertheless, the FPAC contends that even if such an evaluation is not instituted, the process of soliciting the “campus climate” about the University President would not be without merit.

Thus, the procedure for the evaluation of upper administrators by faculty, staff, and students as adopted by the University Senate in March 2012 was based on a decanal review process in place since 2003. For a detailed history of the decanal review process, refer to the Senate report: [Response to Charge A-0812A, Part 2, Evaluation of Upper Administration](#).

Briefly, the procedure for the evaluation of administrators by faculty, staff, and students was first proposed by the New Brunswick Faculty Council in March of 2000, which recommended that its Personnel Policy Committee, other faculty governance, and the administration develop a review system for evaluating, at a minimum, all faculty administrators (e.g., directors, deans) and others whose performance impacts teaching, research, and service. The policy subsequently adopted by the Senate and then-President Lawrence in March of 2001 recommended that the evaluation would be implemented by an ad hoc deans evaluation committee (DEC) and informed by faculty, administrators, students, and, if appropriate, outside reviewers; contain a mandated survey; and stipulate a review period no less frequent than every 5 years; the process lacked, however, a procedure whereby a review could be triggered by the unit within the 5-year period.

In 2003, the new administration of President McCormick and Executive Vice President Furmanski asked the FPAC to revisit the process to ensure that results of the decanal evaluation were more reliable and comprehensive. This iteration, adopted by the Senate and President McCormick in March of 2004, included a more thorough evaluation process based on a plan devised by the DEC and approved by the unit before the evaluation commenced. In addition, a survey was not mandated and was left instead to the discretion of the DEC. Feedback on the results of the evaluation as well as any policy changes stemming from the process was to be provided to the unit. Although the stated goal of the evaluation was to improve the performance of the dean, it was expected that the evaluation would also be useful in identifying institutional weaknesses.

The decanal review process was again scrutinized in 2009 and, as a result, the current policy in place for decanal evaluations was adopted by the Senate in March, 2010. The current policy states that the review period of new deans should be earlier than the 5th year in office, the process can be triggered mid-term, ensures that meaningful input from faculty (including PTLs and annuals), students and staff is considered, and, unlike the previous iteration, mandates a survey. As in the previous process, however, data collected by the DEC should focus in the following areas: quality of relationship with, and care for, students; quality of collegial relationship between the dean and the faculty and/or fellows; performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff; performance of financial and strategic management of the unit’s resources; overall performance. Units may also collect additional data, such as: respondent’s familiarity with dean’s performance in position; quality of faculty and program development; fairness and ethics; leadership; communication; functional competence; commitment to diversity; and interpersonal skills.

Once completed, a confidential report of the DEC shall be sent to the dean, along with a request for a written response. A non-confidential summary of the findings are distributed to the unit by way of feedback. The supervisor then meets with the faculty to discuss results.

In 2011, the FPAC considered the feasibility of extending the decanal review process to include vice presidents and other administrators, a process completely new for Rutgers. Details of this process may be found in the March, 2012 report [Response to Charge A-0812A, Part 2, Evaluation of Upper Administration](#). In brief:

- Administrators subject to this policy included those that have academic responsibilities (budgets, teaching assignments, chair assignments, promotion recommendations, etc.), namely, the President, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), and the Chancellors.
- The decanal policies already in place were readily extended to the EVPAA and the Chancellors since their “supervisor” was identified as the President of the University. For the President the process was formulated as input to the BoG.

The FPAC gave much consideration to the nature of the evaluation for the *University President*. As the President reports to the BoG, the Senate endorsed a recommendation that urges this body to institute a periodic, comprehensive evaluation of the University President, conducted every four years, to which an evaluation of the President by faculty, staff, and students provides input. Unlike the review process for other administrators, however, the BoG in its role as “supervisor” is not involved in the evaluation process; instead, that role is performed by the Executive Committee (EC) of the University Senate.

In the policy endorsed by the Senate in March, 2012, a University-wide policy for evaluation of the University President is extended every 4 years that serves to inform the BoG in its comprehensive evaluation of the President. As with the other review processes, however, an evaluation can be triggered at any time. An ad hoc President Evaluation Committee (PEC), the majority of which must be faculty members, is formed by the EC of the University Senate with appropriate input from the joint Faculty Councils or other representative body of each campus.

The PEC is instructed to ensure that meaningful faculty (including PTLs and annuals), student, and staff input is received during the evaluation process. Data should be collected in the performance areas listed above as well as the President’s ability to represent the University to elected officials and to the people of the state of New Jersey. Surveys are mandated.

A non-confidential summary of the findings are distributed to the faculty by way of feedback. The President then meets with the joint Faculty Councils to discuss results as they pertain to University policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation, and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

D. Discussion and Recommendations

The FPAC discussed the charge in four meetings: October, November, and December 2012 as well as January 2013. Rationale and background for this portion of the charge may be found in section E.III. (page 14) of the 2012 Senate report. The process detailed below is essentially the same as that endorsed by the Senate, with only one change (underlined) which pertains to the period of the evaluation cycle. Consultations with the administration indicated that a four year cycle for, especially, a newly incoming University President is too short, hence the following change was included:

- Recommendation 1, line two: The University President shall normally be evaluated by faculty,

staff, and students in the University every six years

Recommendation 1: The Senate recommends the following process for the periodic evaluation of the University President:

1. The University President shall normally be evaluated by faculty, staff, and students in the University every six years, but an evaluation can be triggered at any time by the Senate Executive Committee (EC), by the President, or by the faculty or the students. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the University's tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students, to the chair of the University Senate, triggers a secret ballot by the faculty, run by the University Senate, where the question of whether to have an out-of-cycle evaluation of the President, to commence at the current semester, is decided by majority vote of those voting. An evaluation by petition can only be requested once between regular evaluations.
2. A single semester should normally suffice for completion of the evaluation.
3. The President will meet with all of the campus Faculty Councils in a joint session augmented by the Senate EC to initiate the process. Generally, this joint body of Faculty Councils will also be the "appropriate constituency body."
4. The University Senate will be informed by the President in case of major delays or irregularities.
5. An ad hoc President Evaluation Committee (PEC), the majority of which must be faculty members⁵, will be formed by the Senate EC, as follows:
 - 5a. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit three slates of faculty members⁵, as follows: twelve from New Brunswick, six from Newark, and three from Camden. The president will choose four members from the New Brunswick slate, two from the Newark one and one from the Camden slate. In submitting the slates, care should be taken so that the larger units are represented. In choosing the committee members the President should also take such representation into account.
 - 5b. Up to two administrators can be appointed by the Senate EC in consultation with the President.
6. The PEC will meet as a body to elect its chair.
7. The President will be asked by the Senate EC to submit to the committee, within a reasonable time frame, a statement detailing responsibilities and accomplishments that will include data as well as his/her vision and strategic plan for the University. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the PEC. The President's statement should be made available to those providing input to the process.
8. The PEC, in consultation with the Senate EC, will decide on whether or not to include in its membership representatives from among the staff, students, alumni, or other constituencies (from within or without the university) with whom the President may have substantial contact. In so doing, the PEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty⁵. The PEC will also decide on the manner of choosing such members. In the case of student membership, the student representative(s) should be chosen from among student senators, and/or officers of the appropriate student governing association.
9. The PEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the President and the Senate EC. In so doing, the committee shall enjoy significant latitude, but will

⁵ Full-time or part-time faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors.

need to ensure that meaningful faculty (including PTLs and annuals), student, and staff input is received during the evaluation process, and that the process provides for anonymity of respondents who request it. Furthermore, in addition to any specific questions or criteria, PECs will include in the review process evaluations of the President in the following areas, as appropriate to the individual survey:

- Quality of relationship with, and care for, students
- Quality of collegial relationship between the President and the faculty
- Performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff
- Performance of strategic and financial management of the University's resources
- Fundraising
- Performance representing the University to elected officials and to the people of the state of New Jersey and beyond
- Overall performance

9a. Several surveys should be formulated by the PEC. Provision should be made for narrative comments as well as a series of multiple-choice evaluations. The multiple-choice evaluations will include the five performance areas listed above plus any specific additions from the campus faculty.

Generic templates for a faculty and a staff survey are available for decanal evaluations and can be amended as necessary. They are only meant to be of assistance to the PEC, which that can add, amend, or delete elements as appropriate for the particular case. These surveys have been formulated based on the initial survey used for decanal evaluations by SCILS. Nevertheless, all previous survey formats should be kept by CTAAR and be made available to the PEC for consideration.

The PEC should direct different surveys to several groups: faculty in general, administrative and non-administrative staff, department chairs, deans, fund raising professionals, etc.

Analysis of the data will be programmed so that means and other statistics will be standard outputs, along with anonymous listing of the narrative comments. This summary of respondents' input is all that will be made available to those having access to survey results. The system must provide privacy assurances for the faculty, staff, students and other respondents. Use of an electronic survey is recommended, but for units using an online survey, non-electronic copies of the survey instrument will be provided to faculty, students or staff who do not wish to participate in the electronic version, and the PEC will need to determine how to protect the confidentiality of those respondents and how to ensure that their views are included in the overall evaluation. Response rates for the survey by type of respondent (tenured and tenure-track faculty, other faculty, student, administrative and non-administrative staff, other) should be reported along with the survey results.

The PEC may wish to collect additional data, such as:

- Respondent's familiarity with President's performance in position
- Quality of faculty and program development
- Fairness and ethics
- Leadership
- Communication
- Functional competence
- Commitment to diversity

- Interpersonal skills
- 9b. The survey(s) will be carried out by the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTAAR). Numerical results will be tabulated by CTAAR, as will the written comments. Nevertheless, evaluating the data and formulating the report is the task of the PEC and should not be delegated to the staff of CTAAR.
 - 9c. The committee or an external subcommittee will write a summary of the written comments and will correlate them with the numerical results (if any).
 10. A thorough evaluation process should be carried out by the PEC. Additional input could include discussion summarized in narrative form (similar to departmental narratives used in faculty personnel decisions), or letters and communications from individuals commenting on the President's performance, and results of interviews, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved if desired by those respondents. PECs are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The President is encouraged to make available funds for secretarial support to the PEC.
 11. Once completed, the report of the PEC shall be sent to the President, along with a request for a written response. The PEC will have access to the President's response and will consider modification to the original evaluation report in response to the President's reply, particularly in cases where the President has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation. The PEC will append the response of the President to its report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute one copy each to the Chair of the Board of Governors, the President, and the chair of the University Senate. It is expected that the results will be confidential and that those with access to the results will respect that confidentiality.
 12. The PEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty. In preparing this summary, the PEC may also wish to summarize the response of the President. The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the PEC. It is suggested that some results of the survey be part of the feedback summary. Since this policy further dissociates the evaluation process from personnel decisions by prescribing different times for each, more detailed communication of the evaluation results to the faculty from the PEC is appropriate. The President should have the opportunity to suggest changes to the summary to the committee. The PEC will decide whether there should be feedback to other constituencies that have provided input to the evaluation and on the content of this feedback.
 13. The President should meet with the joint body of Faculty Councils to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to University policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

Recommendation 2: The FPAC urges the University Senate to affirm its previous recommendation (Recommendation 3, page 13) from the March 2012 report that asks the Rutgers Board of Governors to institute a periodic comprehensive evaluation of the President of the University, to which faculty, staff, and students will provide input. The only change in the current recommendation is that such an evaluation is conducted every six years.

E. RESOLUTION

In Support of Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee Report and Recommendations:

Whereas, the University Senate's Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee has examined and reported

on the first part of charge A-0812B, evaluation of the University President by faculty, staff, and students; and

Whereas, the University Senate has reviewed the Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee's report and its recommendations for the establishment of a policy for the evaluation of the University President; and

Whereas, the University Senate strongly affirms a previous recommendation to the Board of Governors to institute a periodic evaluation of the University President; and

Whereas, the University Senate finds those recommendations to be sound and in the best interests of Rutgers University; and

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Rutgers University Senate endorses the Report on the first part of the charge on Evaluation of Upper Administrators by Faculty, Staff and Students, pertaining to the University President, and urges the administration to implement its recommendations. It further instructs the chair of the University Senate to communicate to the Board of Governors the recommendations pertaining to the evaluation of the President.

Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee members:

Gould, Ann, SEBS (F), Co-Chair - *Executive Committee Liaison*
Panayotatos, Paul, GS-NB (F), Co-Chair - *Executive Committee Liaison*
Alizadeh, Farid, RBS:UNB (F)
Bagchi, Prosenjit, Engineering (F)
Bell, Rudolph, SAS-NB (F)
Boustany, Nada, GS-NB (F)
Creese, Ian, Other Units-N (F)
Fernandez, Vivian, VP for Faculty & Staff Resources (*non-senator*)
Fishbein, Leslie, SAS-NB (F)
Goldstein, Daniel, GS-NB (F)
Harris, John, SAS-NB (F)
Hetling, Andrea, EJBSPPP (F)
Hinch, Jane, SAS-NB (F)
Janes, Harry, SEBS (F)
Laguna, Asela, NCAS (F)
Midlarsky, Manus, SAS-NB (F)
Niederman, Robert, GS-NB (F)
Robinson, Joanne, SON-C Dean (A)
Saltzman, Cynthia, PTL-NB (F)
Schurman, Susan, SMLR Dean (A)
Simmons, Peter, Law-N (F)
Suplee, Patricia, FAS-C (F)
Taylor, Christopher, SON-C (S)
Tehrani, Reza, Newark Staff
Thompson, Karen, PTL-NB
Toney-Boss, Permelia, Newark Staff
Wagner, Mary, Pharmacy (F)
Williams, W. Ray, PTL-N (F)