Rationale
Administrators are reviewed by a committee every five years for purposes of personal development, the identification of strengths and weaknesses, and to help them to improve their performance. Each review includes the distribution of a questionnaire to members of the campus community that includes room for both quantitative and qualitative evaluation. Senate Policy 3A, Attachment B (“Academic Administrative Review Questionnaire Regarding”) directs that the administrator be reviewed in several categories on a five-point Likert scale in which the midpoint is correlated to a response of “good”. Two issues have been raised with this scale. The first is whether the midpoint should be a neutral term. The second is whether this scale should not be more in line with scales used elsewhere in the university. Thus this amendment to Senate Policy 3A, Attachment B replaces the existing scale with one that labels the points from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”.

Amendment to Senate Policy 3A, Attachment B

SAMPLE DATE

TO: Colleagues at San Francisco State University
FROM: Academic Administrative Review Committee for _____________
SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF:

We are sending you the attached questionnaire because we believe that you are familiar enough with the performance of the above named academic administrator during the past five years to assist us in performing an evaluation. Please comment on issues you have knowledge about. If you believe that you are not familiar enough with the administrator’s work, please check the box below, sign your name, and return the blank questionnaire to ____________, chair of the review committee. If you believe you can help evaluate his/her performance, please answer to the best of your ability the questions that follow, sign your name at the end, and return the completed questionnaire to the chair of the committee.

The Administrative Review Committee will not use any anonymous responses. However, it will preserve, to the extent permitted by law, the confidentiality of those who submit evaluations and will not show individual responses to the administrator under review.

We appreciate any assistance you can provide in this review process. It is an important process which is designed to make the administrator and supervisor aware of the perceptions of professional associates, as well as to enhance the administrator’s effectiveness and professional development.

Please return the questionnaire by ______,
to ________, Chair of the Administrative Review Committee,

c/o Office of the Provost/VP for Academic Affairs, ADM 455.

☐ I do not know the work of this administrator well enough to participate in the review.

_________________________  __________________________
Signature                      Date

Please print name and title.

Please evaluate the performance of the administrator under review in as many as possible of the categories listed below. Fill in the □ with a number from 1 to 5, using a scale on which 1 = strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, and 5 = strongly agree. In the space provided, or on a separate sheet of paper, please explain why you rated the administrator’s performance as you did. If you have insufficient knowledge in any of the categories to evaluate the performance of the administrator, please leave the □ blank and write “no information” in the space provided.

EXAMPLE: □ COMMUNITY RELATIONS. The administrator works effectively with diverse community groups and agencies. If you strongly agree with this statement, write in [5] in the box. If you are neutral on this statement, place a [3] in the box. If you strongly disagree with this statement, place a [1] in the box.

☐ LEADERSHIP. The administrator has vision, anticipates future changes effectively motivate colleagues and subordinates, and is in other respects an effective leader.

☐ DECISION-MAKING ABILITY. The administrator makes informed decisions, finds viable solutions to problems, and acts in a timely fashion.

☐ ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS. The administrator employs a capable staff, properly supervises their work, and otherwise maintains an effective organization.

☐ INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS. The administrator is perceived as fair, has effective working relationships, is collegial, provides mentoring, and maintains good morale.

☐ COMMUNICATION. The administrator keeps people informed, provides clear directions, represents the unit on the University well, and in other respects communicates effectively.

☐ KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNIT. The administrator is familiar with the fields of endeavor, programs, personnel, facilities, resources, and other components of the unit.
KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNIVERSITY. The administrator knows the University’s facilities, structure, personnel, makes good use of its services and resources, and implements its policies and procedures.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE. Given the evaluations of the administrator that you have already made, how would you assess his/her overall performance?

For this questionnaire to be used as part of the Administrative Review data, please sign and print your name and sign below:

______________________________  ________________________________  ________________________________
Signature  Name (printed or typed)  Institution/Affiliation

☐ faculty  ☐ staff  ☐ administrator  ☐ off-campus respondent

Evaluator of the Administrator in Specific Job Assignments.

These specific job assignments were developed by the Review Committee and the Administrator using her job description. Please check those areas where you have knowledge of the administrator’s performance and comment upon them in the space provided.

☐ PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT/FACULTY: Does the Dean support the professional growth of the faculty?

SAMPLE QUESTION

☐ PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT/DEAN: Is the Dean professionally active.

SAMPLE QUESTION

☐ KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINES: Does the Dean understand the disciplines within the College?

SAMPLE QUESTION

☐ OFF CAMPUS/COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Does the Dean interact effectively with the off-campus community?

SAMPLE QUESTION

*** Approved by the Academic Senate at its meeting on September 21, 2010***

***Signed by President Corrigan on December 10, 2010***