



Eastern Kentucky University

Policy and Regulation Library

Academic Regulation: 4.8.1ACR

Responsible Office(s): Office of the Provost

Effective: February 20, 2025

Next Review Date: Spring 2030

Academic Regulation: 4.8.1ACR

Annual Evaluation of Academic Administrators

Statement

Regular evaluation of academic administrators is vital to ensuring ongoing improvement, development, and accountability. Eastern Kentucky University utilizes both annual and comprehensive evaluations in assessing the performance of academic administrators. The goal of annually reviewing administrators is to recognize exemplary performance, identify areas for potential growth, establish goals, and create professional development plans. The third-year comprehensive evaluation also includes participation and appraisal from all persons in a position to express valid viewpoints in the performance of individual administrators.

Evaluations shall provide the rational basis for decision making that considers the best interest of the academic mission of the University and shall result in a summary report that recognizes the necessity for transparency, accountability, fairness, and confidentiality.

All administrators at Eastern Kentucky University serve with annual appointments and at the pleasure of the President and Board of Regents. It should be understood throughout this document that all decisions regarding appointment or reappointment of academic administrators require approval at this level.

Entities Affected

- Academic Administrators
- Faculty
- Staff

Criteria

The following broad criteria shall guide the evaluation of administrator performance in all reviews: leadership, communication, administration, development, and relationships. Areas for consideration within each category may include, but are not limited to:

A. Leadership

1. Creates a climate in which faculty and staff are encouraged to develop and continuously learn.
2. Holds self accountable and ensures accountability in others for achieving results.
3. Ensures that others have the resources, information, authority, and support needed to achieve strategic objectives.
4. Effectively advocates for the needs of the unit.
5. Reflects an ability to cope with conflicting requirements of multiple constituencies.
6. Has a long-range vision, thinks and plans beyond year-to-year operation.

B. Communication

1. Articulates a clear vision for the unit.
2. Fosters an environment of open, honest, and respectful discussion of all issues.
3. Creates an environment that ensures others have appropriate access to information which may be useful to them.
4. Listens attentively and with empathy to concerns expressed by others.
5. Communicates effectively to internal and external audiences by tailoring message, style, and content.

C. Administration

1. Displays an ability to plan, organize, establish priorities, and make decisions.
2. Effectively identifies, attracts, and hires faculty/staff.
3. Allocates resources prudently and fairly.
4. Objectively and fairly evaluates faculty/staff.
5. Involves appropriate persons in decision-making processes.
6. Handles conflict resolutions in fair and consistent manner.

D. Unit Development

1. Facilitates opportunities for faculty research, other scholarly activity, and professional development.
2. Creates and maintains an environment that supports the open exchange of ideas.
3. Provides support for faculty and staff professional development.
4. Scans the environment to plan strategic approaches and develop solutions for the unit.
5. Encourages evidence-based decisions that are aligned with strategic priorities.
6. Encourages staff and stakeholders in visioning process.

E. Relationships

1. Treats others fairly and respectfully.

2. Recognizes the feelings of others and exhibits an appropriate level of composure, patience, and diplomacy.
3. Effectively cultivates and manages key constituent relationships.
4. Connects people from across collegiate, cultural, institutional, and global boundaries to accomplish goals.
5. Works towards achieving consensus among multiple stakeholders.
6. Creates a positive image of the unit in the local and regional communities.

Procedures

The evaluation of academic administrators will consist of annual reviews over a three year recurring cycle of assessment. The focus in years one and two is narrow while the focus in year three is comprehensive. The primary purpose for reviews is developmental but reviews may be used for retention or merit decisions. In unusual circumstances, a comprehensive review may occur in any year of the review cycle.

Academic administrators who shall be reviewed include:

1. Provost
2. Vice Provost
3. Associate/Assistant Vice President
4. Dean
5. Associate Deans
6. Department Chair or equivalent
7. Other academic administrators designated by the Provost. In making decisions regarding inclusion or exclusion, the following criteria shall apply:
 - a. level and scope of institutional responsibility and impact; and/or
 - b. unit size in terms of budget and/or personnel.

Year One and Two Reviews

1. During the spring semester, but no later than April 1, supervisors shall hold a conference with the academic administrator(s) who report directly to them. At this or subsequent spring conferences, the supervisor and the academic administrator will discuss the administrator's achievements with specific reference to the goals set in the previous conference. This conference will include a brief written summary of the administrator's goals for the next year as well as progress toward or achievement of the previous year's goals.
2. A supervisor may initiate a comprehensive review at any time. However, a comprehensive review shall not be initiated during an administrator's first year.
3. At the conclusion of all conferences, the supervisor shall send to the academic administrator a notice of completion of the review and any actions that resulted from the review.

Year Three Review

1. For the Year Three Review, academic administrators will prepare a brief assessment of their work during the previous three years. The assessment

must address, but is not limited to, the criteria for evaluation set forth in this policy.

2. During the spring semester, but no later than February 15, an evaluation survey adopted by the University and consistent with the criteria for evaluation of academic administrators, shall be sent to all persons in a position to express valid viewpoints of the academic administrators' performance. Such persons may include, but are not limited to, direct reports, faculty, staff, peers, students, and others external to the University. The evaluation survey shall be created by the Office of Institutional Research and approved by the Provost.¹
3. Each Department /College shall establish a Review Committee. The membership of the committee shall be determined by majority vote of the full-time department /college faculty no later than September 30 in the year it is to function. The Provost will work with administrators outside of academic colleges on the selection of a review committee.
4. The review committee is responsible for compiling and summarizing the results of the evaluation survey, and will submit the summary to the administrator's supervisor within 10 business days of receipt of the evaluation survey data.
5. No later than April 15, the supervisor will hold a conference with the administrator to discuss the self-assessment, the review committee's report, and other matters relevant to the administrator's performance. The administrator may append a statement to the evaluation. The supervisor and the administrator shall agree upon a plan for continuous improvement.
6. At the conclusion of the conference, but no later than May 15, the supervisor shall send to all individuals in the affected unit a notice of completion of the review and any actions that resulted from the review.

If the administrator is being evaluated as a non-tenured faculty member, the review committee and the Non-Tenure Evaluation Committee shall be the same; if the administrator is being evaluated for promotion or tenure, the review committee shall be the Promotion and Tenure Committee; and if a comprehensive evaluation is being held during the same year as a non-tenure evaluation, or a tenure or promotion application, the evaluations shall be done concurrently.

Responsibilities

- Academic Administrator
 - Knowing and adhering to Policy 4.8.1
 - Working with the Supervisor to create goals and development plans
 - Implementing each plan
 - Writing a reflection for the Year Three Review
- Office of Institutional Research
 - Creating the evaluation survey consistent with the criteria for academic administrators

- Office of the Provost
 - Approving the evaluation survey for academic administrators.
- Review Committee
 - Compiling and summarizing the results of the evaluation survey
 - Preparing a performance report to be submitted to the administrator's supervisor
- Supervisor
 - Conducting annual reviews of academic administrators who report directly to him/her
 - Working with academic administrators to create goals and development plans

Regulation Adoption Review and Approval

Regulation Revised

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ENTITY</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
February 20, 2025	University Counsel	Editorial Revision
October 18, 2024	University Counsel	Editorial Revision
November 15, 2019	Vice Provost	Editorial Revision/Add Interpretation
June 19, 2017	Board of Regents	Adopted
October 19, 2015	Board of Regents	Adopted
October 2, 2015	President	Approved
May 6, 2015	Provost Council	Approved with amendments
May 4, 2015	Faculty Senate	Approved with amendments
May 1, 2015	Chairs Association	Approved with amendments
October 6, 1990	Board of Regents	Adopted
September 10, 1990	Faculty Senate	Approved

Regulation Issued

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ENTITY</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
December 3, 1979	Faculty Senate	Approved

Interpretations

¹This should be interpreted to mean that the survey instrument used for evaluation of academic administrators that is created by Institutional Effectiveness and approved by the Provost cannot be altered or amended to add additional questions by any unit administering the survey without review and approval of the Provost.
Provost Pogatshnik, November 15, 2019