

# ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW POLICY

## **Purpose**

At five-year intervals, there shall be a collegial review of academic administrators covered by the Management Personnel Plan (MPP). It is understood that the purpose of the review is developmental, to identify areas of strength and weakness, and to help the reviewee improve his or her performance. Information shall be sought from other administrators, faculty, staff, and, where applicable, students and off-campus sources who are directly knowledgeable about the position and performances of the academic administrator for the following purposes:

- 1) To make the academic administrator and the supervisor aware of the perceptions of those who work directly with the academic administrator.
- 2) To enhance the effectiveness and productivity of the academic administrator.
- 3) To assist in the professional development of the academic administrator.

One beneficiary is the administrator who receives information about areas of strength and weakness in: performance of assigned responsibilities, demonstration of commitment to the University, and professional growth. The administrative review should recognize and encourage the accomplishments of the academic administrator and make recommendations for correcting weaknesses.

The relationship of the administrative review to the MPP is its use in setting future MPP goals. Therefore, another beneficiary of the administrative review is the supervisor. The administrative review should provide the supervisor with a long range, comprehensive assessment of the performance of the academic administrator. After examination of the administrative review and discussion with the academic administrator, the supervisor may use the review as a basis for setting or changing MPP goals or establishing professional development plans for the year(s) following the review.

## **Eligibility**

Academic administrators who are in positions designated by HEERA as management and whose employment is governed by SFSU's MPP are covered by this Administrative Review Policy. The list of position titles of academic administrators is found in Attachment D.

## **Frequency of Administrative Reviews**

Each academic administrator will be reviewed in the fifth year of full-time, continuous service in a permanent position. Years in acting status or on leave from the position will be counted as neutral years for determining when the review will be conducted. Partial years of service for academic administrators appointed midway through the academic year will not be counted. The first year of a subsequent review cycle is the year after the last review. The next review in each cycle will occur in the fifth year of full-time continuous service.

### **Administrative Review Committees**

Administrative review committees (ARCs) will be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the immediate supervisor and according to the selection procedures and composition specified in Attachment C. ARCs will have a maximum of five members, with one member chosen from a list submitted by the person being reviewed.

### **Anonymity and Confidentiality**

*Anonymity* is defined as the use of information from sources who do not identify themselves to the administrative review committee. *No anonymous material will be used by an ARC.*

*As employees of the California State University, administrators enjoy the same due process protections against anonymous or otherwise unattributed comments as any other employee. ARCs must provide protection for the maintenance of confidentiality of all information gathered and the due process rights of the individual under review. All ARC deliberations shall be held in executive session.*

*Confidentiality* is defined as the right of individuals who do provide information to an ARC not to be identified to the academic administrator being reviewed or to the supervisor. *It is the responsibility of the ARC to ensure that the confidentiality of the respondents is maintained throughout the entire process.* Under no circumstances except by legal mandate will the academic administrator, the supervisor or anyone other than members of the ARC be allowed to examine raw data or be informed of the responses or comments included in questionnaires, letters, or interviews.

### **Consistency**

Every effort shall be made to achieve consistency in the implementation of these policies and procedures. To achieve this objective, the duties and responsibilities of participants in the review are specified in this policy.

### **Sources of Information for the Administrative Review:**

#### **Questionnaires**

All ARCs will use the same questionnaire. This questionnaire is found in Attachment B. Questionnaires will be sent to a select group of respondents from a list developed by the ARC and the academic administrator. The questionnaire contains an optional section where information can be solicited about the performance of an administrator in the specific roles or duties of a particular position. Questions for this section will be developed by the administrator and each ARC, and will be included as part IV of the questionnaire. (See Attachment B.)

#### **Unsolicited Responses**

An announcement naming all academic administrators who will be reviewed under this policy during the current academic year will be published in CampusMemo. Any response not solicited by the ARC must be by a signed letter which describes the relationship of the respondent to the administrator.

### ***Interviews***

Interviews will be conducted for the purpose of clarifying information in questionnaires and obtaining a more in-depth perspective of the performance of the academic administrator. Interviews will be based upon the self-evaluation prepared by the academic administrator. At least three members of the ARC shall be present at each interview of on-campus interviewees.

### **Final Report of the ARC**

The final report of the ARC shall specify the categories and size of the pool of respondents to whom questionnaires were sent and the categories and size of the pool of those who did respond. The nature of the pool of interviewees (Faculty, Staff, Administrator, Off-Campus Respondent) shall be specified similarly.

The final report of the ARC shall summarize the ARC's analysis of all the data from unsolicited letters, questionnaires, and interviews. This summary shall be carefully prepared to maintain the confidentiality of all respondents.

Final reports of ARCs should be prepared according to the purposes of the administrative review: 1) to make the academic administrator and supervisor aware of the perceptions of those who work directly with the academic administrator; 2) to enhance the effectiveness and productivity of the academic administrator; and 3) to assist in the professional and personal development of the academic administrator. ARCs shall not render judgments about the job description, or make recommendations regarding specific personnel actions which are within the scope of the MPP.

### **Responsibilities/Duties of Participants in Academic Administrative Reviews:**

#### ***The Supervisor***

- 1) The supervisor shall submit to the ARC the academic administrator's current job description and names of individuals he/she thinks are very familiar with the work of the administrator.
- 2) Upon receipt of the ARC's final report, the supervisor shall discuss the report with the academic administrator and, if appropriate, use the report as part of the basis for setting MPP goals for the following year(s).
- 3) The supervisor's participation in the actual review shall be limited to providing information clarification regarding the academic administrator's duties and responsibilities at the request of the ARC.

#### ***The Academic Administrator***

- 1) The academic administrator shall prepare a self-evaluation of his/her performances covering the review period. This self-evaluation shall be written from the perspective of his/her assigned duties and responsibilities.

- 2) The academic administrator shall meet with the ARC to participate in the development of a broad-based representative group of potential respondents who are familiar with the work of the academic administrator; to discuss the self-evaluation; and to develop the job-specific section of the questionnaire, if appropriate. Throughout the review process, the academic administrator may be asked to provide additional or clarifying information or materials by the ARC.
- 3) The academic administrator shall meet with the ARC to discuss the draft of the final report. Upon receipt of the final report, the academic administrator may write a response.

#### ***The Administrative Review Committee***

- 1) The ARC shall meet with the academic administrator prior to gathering any information.
- 2) The ARC shall work with the academic administrator to develop a broad-based, sufficiently large and representative group of potential respondents who are familiar with the work of the academic administrator.
- 3) The ARC shall review and analyze the information it has gathered. ARC members themselves shall not submit unsolicited letters or questionnaires.
- 4) The ARC shall meet with the academic administrator to discuss the draft of the ARC's report. The ARC shall then prepare its final report. If the academic administrator prepares a written response to the final report, the ARC may write its own response to the academic administrator's comments.
- 5) The Chair of the ARC shall give copies of the final report to the supervisor and the academic administrator. (See attachment A.) The Chair of the ARC, serving as custodian of the files, shall keep all data and other documentation for one year after completion of the final report and then destroy the entire file.

#### **Administrative Review Procedures**

During the fall semester, academic administrators to be reviewed, and their supervisors, will be notified by the Provost's Office; ARCs will be appointed; and all preliminary materials for the review will be prepared. During the spring semester, ARCs will collect and analyze data from questionnaires and unsolicited responses; conduct interviews, and prepare their final report after meeting to discuss the draft with the academic administrator. The Chair of each ARC will hold the final report and responses (if any) until final salary decisions under the management personnel plan MPP have been made for the following year. The Chair of each ARC will then forward the final report and responses to the supervisor. The Calendar for Administrative Review Procedures is contained in Attachment A.

**List of Attachments:**

- Attachment A: Calendar for Administrative Review Procedures
- Attachment B: Administrative Review Questionnaire
- Attachment C: Composition of Administrative Review Committees
- Attachment D: List of Academic Administrative Positions Covered by the  
Administrative Review Policy
- Attachment E: Model letter to off-campus sources of information
- Attachment F: Sample Campus Memo Announcement

**“Approved by President Robert A. Corrigan  
On March 22, 2001.”**

**PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCEDURES**

<u>Deadlines</u>	<u>Tasks</u>
End of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Week in December	Nominations for Administrative Review Committee members due to the Provost from the Academic Senate, college/unit, and person being reviewed.
End of 1 <sup>st</sup> Week of February	Supervisor prepares current job description for administrator and submits this description to administrator and committee.
End of 1 <sup>st</sup> Week of February	Committees meet with Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. Provost La Belle will be available for consultation on procedural questions at any time during process.
End of 1 <sup>st</sup> Week of February	Administrator prepares self-evaluation, list of potential respondents and drafts any job specific sections of the questionnaire. Material is submitted to Committee Chair.
End of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Week of February	Provost's Office places notice in <u>CampusMemo</u> listing administrators to be reviewed. <i>(To appear in <u>CampusMemo</u> first week in March.)</i>
Middle of 4 <sup>th</sup> Week of February	Committee meets with administrator. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reviews job description.</li> <li>○ Reviews self-evaluation.</li> <li>○ Develops list of potential respondents to cover all major categories of job description.</li> <li>○ Prepares any job-specific sections of questionnaires.</li> </ul>
End of 1 <sup>st</sup> Week of March	Committee sends out questionnaires with an end of March deadline.
	<b>Spring Break</b>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Week of April	Committee analyzes self-evaluation, job description, and questionnaire results. Committee schedules and conducts interviews as necessary.
1 <sup>st</sup> Week of May	Committee writes draft of report, forwards draft of report to administrator, and schedules meeting with administrator.
2 <sup>nd</sup> Week of May	Administrator meets with committee to discuss draft.

3<sup>rd</sup> Week of May            Committee revises report if committee decides that revisions are appropriate. Committee signs and gives report to administrator who may write a response to the report. Committee may write a response to administrator's response.

**Last Day of Instruction**

by 4<sup>th</sup> Week of May        Committee chair forwards final report and responses to supervisor. Committee chair keeps the final report, any responses, and all data for one calendar year and then destroys all data.

June/July                    Administrator and supervisor meet to discuss administrative review report and administrator's goals and objectives based on outcome of review.

July                            The report of the Administrative Review Committee and responses are sent by the supervisor to Faculty Records for filing in the official personnel file. The only other copy is the administrator's copy.

Approved by President Robert A. Corrigan on  
March 22, 2001

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.



# ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING:

---

*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 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, and 5 = excellent. 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 evaluate the individual as doing an excellent job in this area, write in [5] in the box. If you evaluate the individual as doing a good job, place a [3] in the box. If you evaluate the individual as doing a poor job, place a [1] in the box.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**LEADERSHIP.** The administrator has vision, anticipates future changes, effectively motivates 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.

**Academic Administrative Review questionnaire regarding:**

---

**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 and the University well, and in other respects communicates effectively.

**Academic Administrative Review questionnaire regarding:**

---

**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, and 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

faculty

Name (printed or typed)

staff

administrator

Institution/Affiliation

off-campus respondent

**Academic Administrative Review questionnaire regarding:**

---

**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.*

- PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT/FACULTY:** Does the Dean support the professional growth of the faculty?

**SAMPLE QUESTION**

- PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT/DEAN:** Is the Dean professionally active?

**SAMPLE QUESTION**

- KNOWLEDGE OF 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**

## COMPOSITION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEES

In each category, the pool of names given to the Provost must be at least twice as large as the number which will serve on the Administrative Review Committee from that category. The pool submitted by each unit (College, Academic Affairs, Library, Academic Senate) must be selected according to the election procedures of the unit involved. Each unit will make every effort to ensure that the broadest possible range of expertise and perspectives is represented on the ARC.

**COLLEGE DEANS**—Five members drawn from within and from outside the College.

Composition	Pool	Source of Pool
3 faculty	6 names	College
1 faculty or administrator	2 names	Academic Senate
1 member	2 names	Person to be reviewed

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN, ASSISTANT LIBRARY DIRECTORS**—Five members drawn from within and from outside the Library.

Composition	Pool	Source of Pool
2 members of Library staff	4 names	Library
2 faculty outside Library	4 names	Academic Senate
1 member	2 names	Person to be reviewed

**PROVOST AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS**—Five members drawn from within and from outside Academic Affairs.

Composition	Pool	Source of Pool
2 faculty	4 names	Academic Senate
1 member from Academic Affairs	2 names	Academic Affairs
1 College Dean or Associate Dean	2 names	Academic Affairs
1 member	2 names	Person to be reviewed

## ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW CYCLE

<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Incumbent</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Last Review</u>	<u>Next Review</u>
Dean, College of Creative Arts	Keith Morrison	1/97		2001/02
Dean, College of Science & Engr.	James C. Kelley	8/75	1997/98	2002/03
Dean, College of Business	Ray Maghroori	8/98		2002/03
Dean, College of Humanities	Nancy McDermid	7/79	1998/99	2003/04
Dean of Faculty Affairs	Paul Barnes	6/99		2003/04
AVP, Academic Resources	John Gemello	1/90	1999/00	2004/05
Dean, College of BSS	Joel Kassiola	8/95	1999/00	2004/05
University Librarian	Debbie Masters	8/95	1999/00	2004/05
AVP/Academic Program Dvmt.	Gail Whitaker	8/95	1999/00	2004/05
Dean, CEL	LucyAnn Geiselman	F/00		2004/05
Director, International Programs	Yenbo Wu	F/00		2004/05
Dean, College of Ethnic Studies	Tomás Almaguer	F/00		2004/05
Dean, Undergraduate Studies	Dean Pro Tem	N/A		N/A
AVP, ORSP/Dean, Grad. Stds.	Paul Fonteyn	8/91	2000/01	2005/06
Provost & VPAA	Thomas J. La Belle	7/96	2000/01	2005/06
Dean, College of Education	Jacob E. Perea	7/96	2000/01	2005/06
Dean, College of HHS	Don Zingale	8/96	2000/01	2005/06

**Attachment E:**  
**Model Letter for Off-Campus Sources of Information**

**Date**

«FirstName» «LastName»  
«Company»  
«Address1»  
«Address2»  
«Address3»

Dear«Title» «LastName»:

San Francisco State University is conducting, this spring, a five-year review of the administrative performance of \_\_\_\_\_, ***Title***. This standard review is conducted for all academic administrators, and it has several objectives: to inform the administrator and her/his supervisor about the perceptions of those who work with her/him, to enhance the administrator's effectiveness, and to assist in the administrator's professional and personal development.

\_\_\_\_\_ has indicated that you are familiar with his/her work and may be able to assess his/her effectiveness as an administrator, especially with respect to his/her relationships with members of the community outside the University. If you can evaluate \_\_\_\_\_'s performance, I would appreciate your sending a written evaluation to the Administrative Review Committee by DATE. I serve as chair of the review committee; please send your evaluation to me c/o the Office of the \_\_\_\_\_, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132-4111. While I ask that you sign this evaluation (and print or type your name), please be assured that the review committee will maintain your confidentiality to the extent permitted by law and will not show your response to \_\_\_\_\_.

I thank you in advance for your willingness to participate.

Sincerely,

Chair of the Administrative Review Committee  
and Professor of

CAMPUS MEMO ANNOUNCEMENT  
FOR THE DATE ISSUE

**ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW(S) BEGIN**

Academic Administrative Review(s) is/are under way for the following administrator(s): Name(s) and Title(s)

The Administrative Review Committee(s) (ARC(s)) is/are now soliciting input from members of the campus community, and questionnaires will be distributed shortly. If you do not receive an administrative review questionnaire and would like to participate in the process, you may pick up a questionnaire from the Office of the Provost, ADM 455, or you can receive a questionnaire as an e-mail attachment by contacting: Name, E-mail address, or you can print the questionnaire from the Academic Affairs web site: <http://www.sfsu.edu/~academic/aprq.htm>. You may also direct individual written responses to the ARC Committee Chair(s) c/o the Office of the Provost, ADM 455.

The committee(s) will not use any anonymous responses. However, the ARC(s) will preserve the confidentiality of those who submit evaluations, within the limits of the law.

ARC Committee Chair(s) is/are: Name, title, for Administrator