

6-2-2004

# Distribution of Evaluations of Administrators

Jeanette Rice  
*Georgia Southern University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Rice, Jeanette, "Distribution of Evaluations of Administrators" (2004). *Faculty Senate Index*. 175.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/175>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

*Approved by the Senate: 6/23/2004*  
*Not Approved by the Senate:*  
*Approved by the President: 9/22/2004*  
*Not Approved by the President:*

# Distribution of Evaluations of Administrators

Submitted by Jeanette Rice

6/2/2004

## **Motion:**

---

That all end-of-year self-evaluations of administrators (Unit Heads, Deans) be made available to faculty, along with the corresponding performance evaluation from their superior, prior to faculty being required to complete evaluation questionnaires.

## **Rationale:**

---

Unlike faculty, Unit Heads and Deans are evaluated on a fiscal year calendar, and submit their annual self-evaluations within 2-3 months of the close of a fiscal year. Faculty questionnaires requesting information on Unit Head/Dean performance are required in March or April of the following year. It is unreasonable to expect faculty to be able to accurately assess the performance of their Unit Heads/Deans without access to this information and unfair to the administrators whom faculty are being asked to assess. While this information is available via open records, no faculty member should have to pay to have photocopies made of information that is vital to accurate completion of the evaluation forms. Finally, access to this information may increase faculty participation in the evaluation process.

## **Amendment:**

---

That end-of-the-year self-evaluations of unit heads and deans be made available to faculty prior to faculty being asked to complete evaluation questionnaires.

## **Response:**

---

**Dr. Grube: 9/23/2004:** College and unit level goals for each academic year will be shared with college faculty through mechanisms such as fall college meetings and fall department meetings. These goals will also be available on college and department

web pages and maybe placed in unit newsletters. Evaluation of goal accomplishment, an integral assessment of unit and individual effectiveness, will be shared at the time of evaluation — typically in late spring or early summer — through the same mechanisms stated above.

Minutes: 10/19/2004: Rice Jenkins also reported that the SEC had received a response from the President to a motion (made by Rice Jenkins herself) at the June 23, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion was as follows:

“That all end-of-year self-evaluations of administrators (Unit Heads, Deans) be made available to faculty, along with the corresponding performance evaluation from their superior, prior to faculty being required to complete evaluation questionnaires.”

Rice Jenkins read the President’s response aloud for the record which was as follows:

“College and unit level goals for each academic year will be shared with college faculty through mechanisms such as fall college meetings and fall department meetings. These goals will also be available on college and department web pages and may be placed in unit newsletters. Evaluation of goal accomplishment, an integral assessment of unit and individual effectiveness, will be shared at the time of evaluation — typically in late spring or early summer — through the same mechanisms stated above.”

She noted that it was now incumbent upon faculty to ensure that this information is, in fact, forthcoming and to use it as they see fit to help complete evaluation forms for Deans and Unit Heads.

Minutes 6/23/2004: Motion by Jeanette Rice re: administrator evaluations:

Rice (COST) moved as follows: “That all end-of-year self-evaluations of administrators (i.e., Unit Heads, Deans) be made available to faculty, along with the corresponding performance evaluation from their superior, prior to faculty being required to complete evaluation questionnaires.”

The motion was seconded.

Brown (COBA) offered a friendly, clarifying amendment,

“That end-of-the-year self-evaluations of unit heads and Deans be made available to faculty prior to faculty being asked to complete evaluation questionnaires.”

Rice (COST) accepted the amendment and noted that the rationale for the motion was to improve faculty’s ability to participate in the evaluation of department/unit heads and Deans.

Since faculty are asked to comment on how well they represent us to the outside community, etc., it would be helpful to have a sheet providing goals, activities and future objectives to facilitate the evaluation process. While the information is available via open records, faculty should not have to use that route to have access to it. Virginia Richards (CHHS) wanted confirmation that we are not seeking performance evaluations, which Rice (COST) confirmed.

Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost) noted possible difficulties with time-lines since only six months may be available prior to faculty doing their evaluations. Rice (COST) noted that she had queried Bob Haney (Associate Provost) about evaluation time frames and deferred to him.

Haney (Associate Provost) noted that administrators are evaluated on a fiscal year, but they are evaluated on the fiscal year that is coming to an end. Thus, faculty would not see March, April, May, and June on such a report.

Rice (COST) wondered if administrators could provide something at the end of the calendar year, like faculty do. There was additional discussion on time-lines for evaluations, with Cyr (Moderator) noting that the first trial of this, faculty would be missing approximately four months of that year, but thereafter they would have the four months of the previous year plus the six months of the current year so that nothing would actually be missing any time after the first 6 set of evaluations. Haney (Associate Provost) stated that he did not believe most administrators went back and picked up those previous 4 months.

Rice (COST) reiterated that it seems pointless for faculty to try to complete these surveys, and again asked if it was possible that they could submit on the same yearly cycle that faculty do, providing a self-brag sheet that would facilitate evaluation. It would be beneficial to the administrators and nice for the faculty to be able to see what is going on at that level.

Krug (CLASS) thought it could be helpful because some faculty have no idea what meetings our Department Chair or our Deans typically attend, and if faculty are asked about certain information they have to indicate that there is no opportunity to observe. President Grube thought it was perfectly honest and acceptable to say "I don't know" when that is the case, as he has to do in some areas when evaluating the Chancellor.

Cindi Chance (Dean, COE) did not think any Dean would have an objection to sharing what we have. Her concern would be asking them to submit another form when, in fact, they could be out doing something more beneficial than writing another piece of paper. She added that she would be concerned if she were participating in an activity and not

letting her faculty know, in which case there is a problem with the way she is communicating with her faculty.

Rice (COST) agreed with the latter portion of Dean Chance's statement, but noted that faculty invest a tremendous amount of effort every year on self-evaluations that takes an inordinate amount of time for the purpose of justifying our existence, and that time could also be better spent by faculty doing something more productive. In response to President Grube's comment, Rice (COST) noted that she was unable to answer questions on the evaluation form relating to how well her unit head and/or Dean represents the unit/college to society and/or within the local community, which is something that directly impacts her, that she is concerned about, and that should be available.

President Grube noted that Deans and Department Chairs do justify their existence, as we all do. The problem is that the evaluation is from July 1 to June 30, and so if you ask for something in March, what would be available is the previous fiscal year's evaluation.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) wondered if changing some of the Scantron questions might be in order, agreeing with Rice (COST) that when filling these forms out, she can not answer certain items. The idea of seeing how well goals were met would be appropriate, and would provide a much stronger, better relationship between faculty, Department Chairs and Deans.

Krug (CLASS) asked why administrators were not changed to a calendar year when faculty were, but no information on that was available. Rice (COST) noted she would be in favor of an end of the calendar year report. LoBue (COST) pointed out that the current motion focused only on providing self-evaluation and not the specifics, so the details could be ironed out in a subsequent motion, and noted that passing this motion would provide faculty with more than they currently have. The motion was passed.