

Administrative Review Ad Hoc Committee
Recommendations

1. Written comments should continue as an option on the evaluation survey.
2. Written comments should remain verbatim without summarization or redaction.
3. Cumulative written comments for each survey question should be arranged in a randomized order using a computer program at the time that the comments are aggregated and prior to the release of the survey results. This should be done in such a way as to ensure that the randomized comments are the only record of the results.
4. Written comments should be distributed only to the reviewee and the reviewee's supervisor (i.e., dean to provost, provost to president of the University).
5. Numerical survey results for a dean should be distributed to all faculty in her/his college and to the provost. Numerical survey results for the provost should be distributed to all University faculty and the president of the University.
 - a. All numerical results that are distributed should include the response distribution along with the mean.
6. The front page of the survey instrument should contain a statement indicating the following:
 - a. The survey results are subject to Public Information Requests;
 - b. While the use of faculty identification is needed to be eligible to take the survey, the individual's identity and responses will be kept anonymous;
 - c. The comments are randomized (with a definition of what "randomized" means regarding this process);
 - d. They will be released to the reviewee and his/her supervisor verbatim;
 - e. The comments should be of a professional nature;
 - f. The purpose of the survey and how it will be used; and
 - g. If a Public Information Request is made for the survey results, the randomized verbatim comments will be released, which could mean the respondent may be identified based on the content of his/her remarks.
7. The evaluation process should become part of the Faculty Senate Rules in order to ensure a consistent administrative evaluation process. Any templates associated with this process should be maintained in the Faculty Senate Office.
8. For new deans, consider conducting an evaluation at the end of his/her first year.
9. The provost should work with college councils (or their equivalents) to establish a process for conducting evaluations for administrators below the level of the dean.
 - a. Perhaps the date of the first evaluation could be noted in the new administrator's contract letter.
10. A new evaluation instrument should be written using best practice techniques, without content carry over from the previous survey.
 - a. To determine best practice techniques, consult UT faculty survey experts for their feedback on the current evaluation instrument and include a review of other universities evaluations instruments.

- b. If using the current instrument draft as a starting point for the new instrument, then:
 - i. make each bulleted item its own question;
 - ii. to minimize survey fatigue, review each bulleted item to see if some can be combined or deleted; and
 - iii. ensure the bulleted items are questions faculty are in a position to evaluate to minimize NA responses.
11. Consider merging members of the two ad hoc committees to form a new implementation committee; as these committee members are aware of the issues.