

Policies of the University of North Texas	Chapter 6
<b>15.1.25 Annual Evaluation and Reappointment of Academic Administrators</b>	Faculty Affairs

**Policy Statement.** Appropriate stewardship of resources, cooperation and collaboration toward department, college, and university goals, and the ability to compromise and work to benefit these units and their constituents are expected of academic administrators, as are respect for diverse personalities, perspectives, styles and demographic characteristics, and maintenance of an atmosphere of civility.

The University of North Texas requires regular, ongoing evaluation of academic administrators to improve performance of their administrative roles and assure accountability for the achievement of institutional goals. The assessment is comprehensive and is used in making reappointment decisions. The evaluation process requires performance criteria, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, faculty, and staff input.

**Applicability.** Academic administrators

**Definitions.**

1. **Academic administrator.** The Texas Education Code (§ 51.948) defines an academic administrator as “a person who has significant administrative duties relating to the operation of the institution, including the operation of a department, college, program, or other subdivision of the institution.” Examples of such administrators include but are not limited to deans, associate deans, assistant deans, and department chairs.

**Procedures and Responsibilities.**

1. To provide the basis for meaningful and productive evaluation, each unit must prepare performance criteria consistent with the position description for all academic administrators. These performance criteria should be developed at the unit level (department for chairs, college for deans, etc.) with input from and approval by the unit administrator to whom the administrator being evaluated reports, and should address expectations common to all academic administrators. The job descriptions should define the duties and responsibilities of each administrator, while providing a mechanism for short-term and long-term goal setting.
2. The campus-wide criteria for evaluating administrators will include consideration of performance in the main areas of academic administration: leadership/vision/planning; faculty and staff allocation, recruitment, development, retention; instructional, research, and service programs; student recruitment, advising, and oversight; development/advancement goals; budget/financial stewardship; and management responsibilities, as applicable

3. The evaluation will include multiple inputs including, but not limited to, a self-evaluation and input from faculty, staff, and other administrators. For some administrators, relevant off-campus constituencies will provide feedback.
4. The evaluation process provides sufficient flexibility to allow individual colleges or units to continue or develop their own procedures to review college or unit specific issues. However, local processes must be consistent with overarching university expectations.
5. The unit administrator is responsible for initiating the evaluation process, using feedback from performance criteria, self-evaluations, peer evaluations, faculty, and staff evaluations, appointing relevant review committees, and determining and meeting all evaluation deadlines.
6. The University provides due process for complaints and grievances; redress of such grievances will follow University guidelines.

Responsible Party: Supervisory unit administrators and subordinate unit administrators.

#### Procedures for Annual Evaluation.

1. All academic administrators will be evaluated annually by their immediate supervisors to determine the individuals' effectiveness as an administrator in achieving the university's and the unit's predetermined goals and objectives.
2. The administrator will communicate unit goals and action plans for the upcoming academic year with faculty and staff.
3. The administrator being evaluated will prepare a self-evaluation of the year's achievements and accomplishments related to the established goals and objectives. Additionally, the summary will include significant activities and accomplishments that were not included in the original goals and objectives. The self-evaluation shall be provided to the supervisor.
4. The supervisor will use appropriate information in evaluating the administrator's performance. At a minimum, this information will include the administrator's job description, the administrator's self-evaluation, and the results of the Administrative Effectiveness Survey administered by the Faculty Senate.
5. After preparing a written evaluation of the administrator, the supervisor will meet with the administrator to discuss his or her performance and effectiveness.
6. The supervisor will report the results of his/her evaluation of the unit administrator to the appropriate governing committee within the unit.

7. The annual evaluation will be retained in the administrator's personnel file.

Responsible Party: Supervisory unit administrators and subordinate unit administrators.

Procedures for Reappointment.

1. Reviews for reappointment of academic administrators will begin in the penultimate year of appointment replacing all other forms of administrative evaluation in the year in which it is conducted.
2. The supervisor (or his/her designee) will designate an Administrator Evaluation Committee (AEC) to solicit the review materials and make a reappointment recommendation to the supervisor.
3. The review will include a self-evaluation of the unit's achievements and goals during the review period. The self-assessment may include, but is not limited to, the following: an articulated administrative philosophy; an overview of major activities and significant contributions; significant issues facing the unit; and a discussion of future plans and goals for the unit.
4. The reappointment review process must also solicit faculty and staff input on the administrators' leadership abilities and accomplishments. Feedback from departmental faculty and staff must be collected in a way that preserves anonymity and addresses suggestions for improvement.
5. The supervisor will use the administrator's job description, self-evaluation, faculty and staff inputs, and other evaluative reports made available through the Faculty Senate and Administrator Evaluation Committee, in preparing the final report and making the reappointment decision.
6. The supervisor will meet with the administrator to share the results of the comprehensive report and indicate specific actions for continuous improvement if a reappointment is made.
7. Prior to reappointment or promotion of the administrator being evaluated, the supervisor will report the results of his/her comprehensive evaluation of the unit administrator to the appropriate governing committee within the unit.
8. Supervisors, on their own initiative or as a consequence of a majority vote of the vote unit faculty, can institute an interim review. If an interim review is requested, the comprehensive evaluation process will be followed.

Responsible Party: Supervisory unit administrators and subordinate unit administrators.

**References and Cross-references.**

Tex. Educ. Code § 51.948

Tex. Educ. Code § 51.942

**Forms and Tools.**

None.

Approved: 1990

Effective: 1990

Revised: 8/93; 8/98; 5/01; 5/15