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.


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 Kapi’olani 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, demonstrate adjustment and constructive use of the assessment, and, finally, to lead the way in the use of ePortfolios so as to begin the institutionalization of the culture of ePortfolios.
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Proposal

Individuals and Bodies to Whom/Which this Applies:

- Faculty Senate
- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellors
- Deans
- Department Chairs / Unit Heads (annual evaluation survey and annual share-out only)
- For possible future inclusion: Staff Council and Staff Council Chair, CAAC and CAAC Chair, any other decision-making bodies—composition of Leadership Review Committee will have to change

Basic Processes

- Annual evaluation survey (evaluation of the above individuals/governing bodies)
  - Applies to all of the above every year
  - Electronic
All members of the Kapi'olani CC community may participate (faculty, staff, admin., student government)

- Results tabulated by OFIE
- Results reported to individual or body evaluated
- Results not made public at this time
- Individual or body evaluated must post in ongoing ePortfolio results and an informal but substantive reflection on results by specific due date (see below for due dates) LRC chair (whole LRC?) has access to this ePortfolio (except for DCs/UHs)
- Reflection reviewed by Leadership Review Committee (see composition below)

- 5-year portfolio review
  - Applies to
    - Faculty Senate
    - Chancellor
    - Vice Chancellors
    - Deans
  - Department Chairs / Unit Heads do NOT participate in portfolio (they have promotion dossiers to do)
  - Faculty Senate Chair (or Vice Chair?) responsible for updating Faculty Senate portfolio during his/her term as chair
  - Self-evaluation, similar to promotion dossier
  - Presented in ePortfolio
  - Maintained continuously, reviewed every 5 years
  - Staggered reviews for benefit of busy campus and Leadership Review Committee

- Major categories
  - Leadership philosophy
  - Discussion of work, including
    - Reporting of and response to annual evaluation survey
  - Clear discussion of how work directly supports student engagement, learning, & success and faculty’s work to promote student engagement, learning, & success with evidence
  - Professional development endeavors
  - Community connection / public relations endeavors

- Submitted to reviewing individuals/bodies as follows
  - Faculty Senate
    - Leadership Review Committee (see composition below)
  - Chancellor
    - Leadership Review Committee
    - Submitted, with LRC reviews, to VP of CCs
    - BOR (in spirit of T/P dossiers)
• Vice Chancellor
  • Leadership Review Committee
  • Submitted, with LRC reviews, to Chancellor
  • BOR (in spirit of T/P dossiers)?
• Deans
  • Vice Chancellor
  • Leadership Review Committee
  • Submitted, with LRC reviews, to Chancellor
  • BOR (in spirit of T/P dossiers)?
  
  o Evaluatee/leader offered opportunity to meet with and/or respond to reviews after LRC review is finished and before submitting to Chancellor or VP, as appropriate

• Annual share-out
  o Applies to all
  o Major categories
    ▪ Highlights of work for the year
    ▪ Discussion of self-improvement endeavors, which may or may not include direct report of annual evaluation survey results, but must include interpretive summary at least
    ▪ Inclusion of evidence as appropriate
  o Public (campus) presentation
  o Approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour in duration

Roll out

• Staggered beginning, to avoid portfolio reviews all happening in same year
  o Year 1: AY 2011-2012
    ▪ Policies and procedures finalized
    ▪ Evaluation surveys for all
    ▪ Survey week consistently first week of March
    ▪ Special push on first Friday of March (PD day)
    ▪ Results reported to evaluatee
    ▪ Results and reflection on results posted by all (except for DCs/UHs) to ePortfolio
    ▪ Reflections reviewed (short reviews) by Leadership Review Committee
  o Year 2: AY 2012 – 2013
    ▪ 5-yr. portfolio due for Chancellor & Faculty Senate
    ▪ Annual share-out for all
    ▪ Evaluation surveys for all, see above
  o Year 3: AY 2013-2014
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- 5-yr. portfolios due for Vice Chancellors
- Annual share-out for all
- Evaluation surveys for all, see above
  - Year 4: AY 2014-2015
    - 5-year portfolios due for one half of Deans
    - Annual share-out for all
    - Evaluation surveys for all, see above
  - Year 5: AY 2015-2016
    - 5-year portfolio due for other half of Deans
    - Annual share-out for all
    - Evaluation surveys for all, see above
  - Year 6: AY 2016-2017
    - Program Review and Adjustment year
    - Annual share-out for all
    - Evaluation surveys for all, see above
  - Year 7: AY 2017-2018
    - 5-year portfolios due for Chancellor and Faculty Senate
    - Annual share-out for all
    - Evaluation surveys for all, see above
  - Continues in cycle

Leadership Review Committee

- 5 members
  - 3 C-5 faculty members from campus at large
    - 3-year terms, staggered
    - Rotation list, randomly generated
    - As faculty become C5, their names go on the rotation list at the bottom
    - Chair’s name goes to bottom of rotation list
  - 1 administrator not currently up for review
    - Nominated, appointed, elected, or rotated from admin. team
    - 2-year term
  - 1 chair
    - Elected from and by Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee
    - C-5 level
    - 2 year term, 4 year commitment
    - Service can extend beyond membership on Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee, but chair should continue to attend FS Eval. Committee meetings to keep committee apprised of the LRC work and processes
    - 3 cr. TE per semester of 2-yr. term
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- 1 year of shadowing current chair prior to term
- 1 year of supporting succeeding chair after term completed
- Responsible for working with OFIE to ensure evaluation processes every year
  - Wide distribution of link to surveys
  - Reminders
  - Drafting/revising language to accompany above
  - Ensuring that results get to evaluates in timely manner
- Responsible for convening leadership review committee
- Responsible for ensuring that results reflection responses get written and submitted in timely manner
- Responsible for writing 5-year portfolio reviews
- Responsible for receiving portfolios and ensuring confidentiality
- Responsible for scheduling and facilitating annual share-out
- Responsible for creating/updating and monitoring spreadsheet of decision-making bodies/individuals up for 5-year portfolio in any given year
- Responsible for maintaining LRC membership rotation list
- Responsible for liaising with admin. regarding the admin. member of the LRC

Due Dates

- Evaluation surveys go out first week in March, push on first Friday in March (OFIE, chair of LRC)
- Results reported to leader by April 30 (OFIE, chair of LRC)
- Results posted to ePortfolio, along with reflection, by May 31 (Leaders)
- Reflections reviewed by LRC, discussed, and responded to by September 15 (LRC and LRC Chair)
- 5-year portfolios due October (same due date as T/P dossiers) (Leaders)
- Reviews of 5-year portfolios due December 31 (LRC, LRC Chair, other reviewers)
- Annual share-outs scheduled during Spring duty week and through January, as necessary (LRC Chair, Leaders)

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evaluation surveys go</td>
<td>survey results</td>
<td>results posted by</td>
<td>reflections reviewed</td>
<td>5-year portfolios</td>
<td>reviews of 5-year</td>
<td>annual share out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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out first week in March, big push for evals first Friday in March
(applies to whole campus, evaluating FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans, DCs, UHs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reported to evaluatee by April 30 (applies to LRC and OFIE)</th>
<th>evaluatee to ePortfolio, along with reflection, by May 31 (applies to FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans)</th>
<th>by LRC, responses written and distributed to evaluatees by September 15 (applies to LRC)</th>
<th>due early October (same day as T/P Dossiers) (applies to FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans)</th>
<th>ePortfolios finished by December 31 (applies to LRC and other reviewing bodies, as appropriate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>during Spring duty week and throughout January, as necessary (applies to FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans, DCs, UHs and whole campus may attend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Procedure for Creation and Implementation

- Small subcommittees of FS Evaluation Committee to work on the following during Spring 2011 & into Fall 2011 & Spring 2012 as necessary:
  - Drafting/revising evaluation survey tools
  - Drafting/revising guidelines for 5-year portfolio & drafting/revising 5-year portfolio review procedures
  - Drafting/revising structure and guidelines for annual share-out
  - Drafting/revising guidelines for response (to annual evaluation survey results) reflection
  - Drafting/revising LRC Guidelines (like DPC Guidelines—should be approved by Union?)
  - Establishment of C-5 LRC rotation list
  - Election of LRC Chair