Introduction

The process of an “administrative review” defines the gathering and analysis of information for purposes of making judgments about performance. Review is an evaluation of “administrators” designed to: recognize competence, reaffirm support, identify problems, redefine responsibilities, and when necessary, reconsider appointments. Administrator, as specified in this procedure, covers those persons designated as “academic administrative, (Title V. Article 1, Section 42700) and/or specifically designated as such by the President. As the responsible officer (appointment, reassignment and termination provisions designated by Title V) the President or his designee makes the final judgment and takes appropriate action. This is based upon duly constituted “review” procedures. All appeals are subject to procedures as set forth by the University and defined by Title V.

1. The Review Process

The review process can be divided into three parts: evaluation design, data analysis and interpretation, and rendering decisions. The process must aim at results which improve and enhance university functions. In this sense, the review process is an on-going activity and facilitates university development. Administrative Review demands a methodology allowing for objectivity, comparative judgments where possible and necessary, and above all, permits a thorough and unbiased evaluation.

The review must operate within a specified set of principles; for example, compliance with policies, laws and regulations, freedom from conflict of interest, accomplishment of established objectives and goals. The process should distinguish among (1) successful performance, (2) administrative performance which requires improvement and (3) performance which is unsatisfactory. To achieve these ends, the review process is guided by criteria covering:

1. 1. the areas of managerial/administrative responsibility as defined officially by a “job description”.
2. 2. the areas of managerial/administrative responsibility as it exists in reality.
3. 3. the performance expectations of the University and those under review.
4. 4. the expectations of those affected within the areas of managerial/administrative responsibility.
5. 5. the time an individual has occupied the position.

The fair evaluation of an administrator’s decisions and actions takes into account the circumstances under which they were performed and the actual results of those decisions and actions.

11. The three components of administrative review have different ends and are best conducted by different groups whose composition reflects the differing roles of each group.

1. Evaluation Design

Gathering information and data, and the application of data to evaluative criteria must be thorough and fair to insure the desired results. The reliability and integrity of this process should be certified by a standing University Committee on Evaluation approved by the President. Committee membership should be based upon recognized expertise in the design of evaluation procedures. The Evaluation Committee includes three members: three faculty and two academic administrators.

In general, evaluation should include survey and interview techniques. The information gathering should cover a large and diverse population, including faculty, staff and students, to insure the validity of the evaluation process. Procedures may vary in some cases depending upon the position and level under review.

2. Analysis

Each academic-administrative officer included in the scope of this policy will be reviewed every five years. The President and/or his designee, where applicable, will review administrative performance annually, and discuss the results with the incumbent. A copy of both evaluations will be made part of the individual’s official personnel file.

Individual review committees, as part of their task, are responsible for data analysis and interpretation.

Specific committees will be appointed as follows:

A. The administrative review committees for School Deans and School Associate Deans will be composed of five members drawn from within and outside the School in question. One member will be selected by the person under review.
B. The administrative review committees for University-wide administrators: Provost, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Dean of Continuing Education will be composed of five members: representing both Academic Affairs and the University at large; one member will be selected by the person under review.

C. The administrative review committee for the Director of the Library will be composed of five members drawn from within and outside the Library; one member will be selected by the person under review.

D. Administrative review committee for the Associate Provost for Student Services will be composed of five members representing the University faculty, the Associated Students, the Student Services staff and the University administration. One member will be selected by the person under review.

E. Other administrators as designated by the President.

Administrative review committees for the Vice President for Administration and the Comptroller will be composed of five members drawn from within and outside the units involved. One member will be selected by the person under review.

Selection of review committee members will be made by the President and/or his designee. The President will inform the Academic Senate of his selections and allow time for reaction by the Senate prior to charging the committee. Membership limited to full-time tenured faculty and staff. Student membership, when applicable, is limited to full-time students in good academic standing.

Five year review will begin in the full of the fifth year of service and will be conducted every five years thereafter. The President and his designee will provide for staggering of reviews, beginning with those persons holding appointments for the longest period of time.

Review committees will provide the President with a written copy of their analysis in accord with a deadline agreed to by the President and the committee. Committee deliberations are bound by the rule of confidentiality. The person under review will be given a copy of the analysis prior to its submission to the President. If the analysis is challenged, these remarks will be included in the final submission to the President. The committee analysis and all relevant information will be made part of the individual’s official personnel file.

3. Rendering Decisions

The President is ultimately responsible for the appointment and termination of academic administrators. He or his designee is therefore responsible for rendering decisions after careful study of the analysis and interpretation of the administrative review committee report.