# Administrative Leadership Feedback Proposals

for **Justification**, see Appendix 1; for **Timeline**, see Appendix 2

## August

### Feedback Survey

more details in Appendix 3

## January

### Annual Update

more details in Appendix 4

## May

### Response Round Table

more details in Appendix 5

---

**Feedback Survey Open to All Faculty**

- Approximately 20 items, Likert scale
- Completely optional, anonymous, and confidential
- Leadership focus areas include: Admin/Management, Communication, Student Learning, Overall Rating,

**Work for faculty/staff members:**

As desired, fill out Feedback Surveys for 1 or more Administrators per year.

---

**Oral Presentation for Campus Community**

- Occurs during regular January Convocation Day meetings
- Areas of focus include: Response to Survey Results, Current Work, Future Plans
- Approximately 20 minutes, total

**Work for faculty/staff members:**

As desired, listen to Administrators' Annual Updates at January Convocation.

---

**Faculty Response to Administrators' Annual Self-Assessments**

- Survey results included in existing Administrator Annual Self-Assessments
- Faculty Senate Round Tables read and provide written responses to Self-Assessments

**Work for most faculty/staff members:** None

**Work for faculty members who choose to serve on FSRT**: Work with 2 other members to read and create written response to ONE Administrator's Self-Assessment

# FAQ

1. **How will this help our campus?**

The Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee anticipates the following benefits for our campus if this feedback system is adopted:

- Increased transparency about the work of administrators, resulting in greater understanding and appreciation
- Greater collaboration between administrators and faculty
- Fuller satisfaction of ACCJC requirements for administrator evaluation
- Clearer understanding, both for administrators and for faculty, of the benefits of "closing the loop" of assessment
- While the feedback survey results themselves will remain confidential, all members of the campus community will have a standardized process for voicing feedback and will see that their voices have been heard.

Please read the attached "Justification" (Appendix 1) for a fuller answer to this question.

2. **Is there a hidden agenda?**

No. This process is not intended to facilitate retaliation or embarrassment. The Committee anticipates that the positive results of this evaluation system will far outweigh any possible small pockets of negativity.

3. **How confidential is the survey data?**

The survey data is intended to be confidential. Like the student evaluation data for faculty members, results are reported directly and exclusively to the person/body being evaluated. This data is to be used for self-improvement as the administrator sees fit and is to be reported in the administrator's self-assessment document (similar to the way faculty are expected to report student evaluation data in their dossiers). The self-assessment documents are read by reviewing bodies, all of whom are expected to keep the contents of the documents absolutely confidential. Administrators should NOT report their survey data during their annual update. However, they should share plans they have made in response to the data.

4. **Who can evaluate whom using the feedback survey?**

The annual evaluation of campus administrators is open to all faculty. Survey participants will be asked to identify whether or not they are members of the administrator's department/unit so the administrator being evaluated can sort responses.

5. **Are there different survey questions for different administrative levels?**

Evaluation questions are the same for all administrative levels. If items do not appear to the survey-taker to apply, s/he may select "N/A" in response to an item.

**6. Why is the Faculty Senate Round Table (FSRT) comprised of only C5 faculty members?**
To avoid any perceived or actual reprisal in faculty tenure and/or promotion dossiers.

**7. Are Department Chairs / Unit Heads expected to participate in this process?**
No. However, in the future, the campus may want to consider the feedback survey as a replacement for the current evaluation survey for Department Chairs and Unit Heads.

**8. Are Authorized Governing Bodies (AGOs) expected to participate in this process?**
No. However, the Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee would be happy to share materials and work with any AGO that has interest in using part or all of this process as a basis for building its own feedback system.

**9. Will the Annual Evaluation Survey replace the 360 survey that administrators currently use?**
The Faculty Senate has no jurisdiction over the 360, which is a system-level evaluation tool.

**10. How long has the Evaluations Committee been working on this initiative?**
The conversation about developing a system for evaluation of leaders that is more satisfactory than the current system began in the Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee more than 10 years ago (and probably even much further back). The Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee has been actively working on this current proposal since March of 2011.

# Appendix 1: Justification

> The [American Association of University Professors] 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* makes it clear that the faculty has a collective expertise that gives it "primary responsibility" in such areas of academic governance as "curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." It is accordingly appropriate that the faculty role in the evaluation of administrators be especially focused on faculty interaction with administrators directly charged with the oversight of the educational program, of students, and of such personnel matters as salaries, promotion, and tenure. If the faculty exercises its role responsibly, such administrators will more likely see the faculty as a resource to be drawn upon, not an enemy to be combated.
>
> --taken from the American Association of University Professors' *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators* (2006) <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/FacultyEvaluationof+Admins.htm>

In an effort to facilitate a greater understanding and appreciation of the work that administrators do in the service of the college's mission, we propose that the Evaluation of Administrators be modified in ways that are outlined on the subsequent pages of this document. This proposal results from the desire to promote transparency and alignment between administrators' and faculty initiatives.

Moreover, incorporating such a practice into our evaluating processes addresses the results of Kapiʻolani Community College's 2006 ACCJC Self Study, in which the accrediting body indicates that the College only partially met the Standard because, "While the majority of leadership levels, institutional governance, and decision making structures are evaluated, the results are not consistently communicated to the faculty and staff at large or used in any meaningful way to make improvements" (Standard Four: Leadership and Governance: Self Evaluation 434).

Faculty involvement in the review process of administrators would facilitate understanding of the work that administrators do, the ways in which their efforts align with faculty efforts, and the ways in which the work of both parties fulfills independent yet overlapping needs of the college. Such a process would also enable increased understanding of ways faculty efforts can best be implemented so as to further administrator initiatives and visa versa, as well as how administrator efforts might be more effectively implemented.

Both faculty and administrators play a significant role in the success of the college. Currently, during the contract renewal and tenure

and promotion process, faculty enumerate all their efforts in comprehensive documents. These extensive documents do more than facilitate the evaluation of the faculty member, which in and of itself is instrumental. These documents provide an overview for administrators of how teachers are interacting with students, current pedagogical trends, as well as the kinds of initiatives faculty see as promising in terms of student support. Involving faculty in the evaluation of administrators would provide the same benefits. Such documents would give faculty an idea of the scope of administrators' work, what their work entails, how administrative work align with faculty efforts, and areas that faculty may not so readily recognize as instrumental to the running of the college.

As noted in the quotation above, universities and colleges across the country have begun to implement administration evaluation processes that involve faculty. We believe that such an effort on our campus would yield positive results in terms of creating a more efficient work environment with the added benefits of promoting collegiality and equality between faculty and administrators, improving transparency, and facilitating greater understanding and appreciation of the ways in which both faculty and administrators contribute to the success of the college.

Modification of the current process to include faculty also provide an opportunity for administration to model ongoing professional development, participate in the culture of evidence, and demonstrate adjustment and constructive use of the assessment.

# Appendix 2: Timeline

- Evaluation surveys go out August; surveys close last day of August
- Results reported to leader by September 30 (results NOT made public at any time)
- Results included in Dean, VC, and Chancellor annual Self-Assessment, which is due in May
- Annual Updates scheduled for Convocation Day in January
- Faculty Senate Round Tables give written feedback on Administrator Self-Assessments sometime in June - September

| *August* | *September* | *January* | *May* | *June - September* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feedback Surveys go out 1 week before duty week; surveys close last day of August | survey results reported to Leader / Leadership body by September 30 | Annual Update during January convocation | Results included in (pre-existing) Administrators' Annual Self-Assessment | FSRTs give written feedback on annual Administrator Self-Assessments (coordinate with Chancellor) |

# Appendix 3: Feedback Survey

Most of the items will be rated on a Likert scale:  Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), (2) Strongly Disagree (1), and Non Applicable, except for the overall rating of the administrator --Very Effective (4) Effective (3) Ineffective (2) Very Ineffective (1). Survey applies to all of the following:  Faculty Senate, Dept. Chairs and Unit Heads, Directors, Deans, Vice-Chancellors, and Chancellor.  Only applicable items should be addressed.  Identity of the responders will not be revealed.

- Faculty Senate
- Deans
- Vice Chancellors
- Chancellor

Links to surveys will be made available annually in August.

## Administrator Feedback Survey

### Demographic Information

**\* 1. Check the box that best describes your position.**

○ I am a member of this administrator's department/unit.

○ I am NOT a member of this administrator's department/unit.

Next

## Administrator Feedback Survey

### Leadership

**2. Please rate this leader's performance on the following elements of leadership.**

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable / No Knowledge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Creates an environment that encourages participation by faculty and/or staff. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Creates an environment that encourages innovation by faculty and/or staff. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Acts in a timely manner. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Recognizes the value of faculty/staff constructive criticism in decision making. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Takes risks and embarks on new directions to improve the college. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Effectively plans for accreditation standards. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Applies fairness and objectivity when making decisions that affect faculty/staff. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Takes responsibility for decisions. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Prev    Next

## Administrator Feedback Survey

### Administration and Management

**3. Please rate this leader's performance on the following administrative and managerial duties.**

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable / No Knowledge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Manages and allocates funds fairly and efficiently. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Makes optimal use of resources (human, financial, and physical) to support teaching and service goals of the college. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Allows for a reasonable amount of time when deadlines are mandated. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Supports training and development needs for faculty and/or staff. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Is effective at resolving conflicts. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Implements recommendations of departments, faculty governance bodies, and committees. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Prev    Next

## Administrator Feedback Survey

### Communication

**4. Please rate this leader's performance on the following communication practices.**

|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable / No Knowledge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consults with faculty/staff adequately before making important changes to current practices. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Is diligent in representing the concerns of faculty/staff throughout the administrative hierarchy. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Provides open communication and transparency in decision making that affects faculty/staff. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Prev    Next

## Student Learning

**5. Please rate this leader's performance on providing the following supports for student learning.**

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable / No Knowledge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fosters a supportive learning environment for students. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Provides a safe, well-maintained, well-equipped physical environment for learning. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Encourages, supports, and rewards excellence in teaching, counseling, and/or other faculty/staff duties that impact student learning. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Creates an environment that encourages faculty/staff innovation and experimentation in supporting student learning. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Prev    Next

## Administrator Feedback Survey

### Overall

**6. Please rate this leader's overall performance.**

○ Very Effective

○ Effective

○ Ineffective

○ Very Ineffective

Please feel free to add comments below.

Prev    Done

# Appendix 4: Annual Update

**Applies to All of the Following**

- Deans
- Vice Chancellors
- Chancellor

**Roll-Out Parameters**

- To be held during Convocation Day in January of each year.

**Presentation Criteria**

- Very generalized share-out of response to survey results, current work, and future plans.
- Presentations should be approximately 15 minutes long, to be followed by a 5 minute Q&A period.

# Appendix 5: Faculty Senate Round Table Response Guidelines & Procedures

**Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to provide basic guidelines and procedures governing the Faculty Senate Round Table (FSRT) responses to Administrators' Self-Assessments. The document also provides guidelines regarding the composition and governance of the FSRTs.

**Effective Date**

TBD

**Guidelines**

1. These procedures and any subsequent changes to these procedures must be approved by a majority vote of the total votes received from the Faculty Senate and the Executive/Managerial (E/M) employees.
2. The procedures may be amended at any time during the year, provided that all of the Executive/Managerial (E/M) employees and the Faculty Senate have been informed in writing of the proposed changes and have been given the opportunity to vote on the proposed changes.
3. The FS Evaluation Committee will be responsible for managing processes necessary to the implementation of changes to this document.

**FSRT Membership**

1. Each FSRT shall be comprised of three rank-C5 faculty members.
2. The three faculty members will serve for the brief period necessary to write a response to their assigned Administrator's Self-Assessment.

**Selection of FSRT Members**

1. The three rank-C5 faculty members for each Administrator's Self-Assessment response will be selected as follows:
   a. A list of all rank-C5 faculty members at the Kapi'olani CC campus will be complied. List will be ordered according to seniority, with the most senior C5 faculty members at the top of the list. Seniority ties will be ordered alphabetically by last name. (NOTE: The initial list will be compiled based on seniority in order to maximize the possibility that soon-to-retire C5 faculty members will have the opportunity to serve.)

b.  This list will serve as a rotation list for service, beginning with the most senior C5 faculty members at the top of the list. When each member completes his/her service, his/her name is moved to the bottom of the rotation list.
c.  As faculty members are promoted to the rank of C5, their names will be added to the bottom of the list.
d.  As C5 faculty members retire, their names will be removed from the list.
e.  If any C5 faculty member called for FSRT service chooses not to serve, his/her name will be moved to the bottom of the list and the next person on the list will be contacted for service. Service may NOT be deferred to a future time, only accepted or refused.
f.  The Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee is responsible for maintaining the rotation list and for contacting potential FSLRP members as their names come to the top of the list for service.
g.  Once a sufficient number of FSRT members have been confirmed (3 x the number of Administrators Self-Assessments to be responded to), assignments will take place as follows: The first 3 FSRT members will be assigned to the highest ranking Administrator. The next 3 FSRT members will be assigned to the next highest ranking Administrator, etc. When there are ranking ties (such as two Vice Chancellors), the Administrators will be ordered alphabetically by last name.
h.  FSRT membership is kept confidential. Members of an FSRT may reveal that they are serving on an FSRT, but may not reveal which Administrator's Self-Assessment they are reviewing.

**Self-Assessment Review Procedures**
1.  In March of each year, the Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee will establish a sufficient active FSRT list (3 x the number of Administrators due to submit a Self-Assessment).
2.  In April of each year, the Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee will coordinate with the Chancellor to:
    a.  Arrange meetings of the FSRT.
    b.  Ensure that all paperwork is completed and deadlines adhered to.
    c.  Ensure that all pertinent guidelines are followed during the review processes.
3.  Each FSRT will prepare a written response to its assigned Administrator's Self-Assessment. This response will include a discussion of strengths and areas in need of improvement. The response will be based on the discussions of each FSRT about the Administrator's Self-Assessment documents and must be approved by all round table members. Minority opinions should be incorporated into the response, and indicated as minority opinions.
4.  All deliberations of the FSRT shall be confidential and shall not be discussed with non-FSRT members. No attempts should be made to contact the Administrator to inform him or her of the FSRT assessment. Procedural questions and concerns are negotiated within the FSRT, and may be discussed with the FS Evaluation Committee as a course of action is decided upon. However, details about the Self-Assessments or about the FSRT's response to the Self-Assessments may NOT be discussed with FS Evaluation Committee members or with anyone outside of the individual FSRT.

5. Upon completion of the response to the Leader's Self-Assessment, each FSRT shall append its response to the Self-Assessment and forward it to the next reviewer.