

**Committee on the Evaluation of Academic Administrators
Evaluation of the Academic Year 2013-2014 Evaluation Process for the Provost
Report to the Faculty Assembly, Submitted 19 Feb. 2015 [DRAFT]**

The survey was distributed via campus mail on Tues. Nov. 25, 2014, to 91 full-time faculty members (including one full-time librarian). Return was solicited by Wednesday, Dec. 17, 2014; 32 responses (35%*) were received.

Results:

Question 1. The purpose of this evaluation process was to contribute to the performance improvement of SUNYIT's academic administrators by providing feedback that applied to their work performance in a manner consistent with widely accepted evaluation practices.

This purpose is appropriate for the work of the Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators.

| Responses | 32 | % |
|-----------|----|-----|
| Agree | 31 | 97% |
| Disagree | 1 | 3% |
| No answer | 0 | 0% |

No narrative comments were offered in response to this question.

Question 2. The committee was concerned about anonymity, so elected to deliver the evaluation instrument on paper in double envelopes, with several options for its return, rather than distribute it and collect information electronically.

To what extent were you concerned with being identified through your responses, considering the AY 2013/2014 delivery method (i.e., paper)?

| Responses | 32 | % |
|--------------------|----|-----|
| Not at all | 23 | 72% |
| A little concerned | 4 | 13% |
| Very concerned | 3 | 9% |
| No answer | 2 | 6% |

No narrative comments were offered in response to this question.

(continues)

* Percentages are rounded.

Question 3. After consideration of the respective merits of 4-point and 5-point scales, the CEAA chose to use a 4-point response scale for most of the evaluation instrument questions.

Question 3a. The use of the 4-point scale was:

| Responses | 32 | % |
|-----------------|----|-----|
| Appropriate | 25 | 78% |
| Not appropriate | 4 | 13% |
| No answer | 3 | 9% |

Question 3b. The use of the 4-point scale offered:

| Responses | 28 | % |
|-----------------------------|----|-----|
| Too few choices | 4 | 14% |
| An appropriate # of choices | 22 | 79% |
| Too many choices | 0 | 0% |
| No answer | 2 | 7% |

Comments[†] (2 received in response to this question):

- People tend to avoid the extremes, therefore with a 4 points [sic] scale if they avoid the outer 2, you only have 2 pts to work with, use 6 or 8
- The standard for social science research is an odd-numbered Likert scale – “5” is most appropriate – there should always be a neutral/middle option

Question 4. Were the questions/prompts in the evaluation instrument clear?

| Responses | 30 | % |
|-----------|----|-----|
| Yes | 27 | 90% |
| No | 0 | 0% |
| No answer | 3 | 10% |

No narrative comments were offered in response to this question.

Question 5. The survey results were distributed by the CEAA to the evaluatee and his supervisor; otherwise, they were kept confidential, as stipulated by the 2007-2008 *Plan for the Evaluation of Academic Administrators*. The CEAA is charged to raise with the President any performance issues arising out of the evaluation process that are of serious or critical concern; as supervision of the Provost’s performance is shared by the Senior Vice President (former Interim President) and by the Chief Executive Officer of SUNY-Poly, the results were shared with both of them. This was announced at the Faculty Assembly meeting on Thursday, Oct. 25, 2014.

The distribution of the survey results to only the evaluatee and his supervisors is appropriate, and should serve as a model for future evaluations.

(continues)

[†] All comments reported verbatim.

Question 5 data:

| Responses | 32 | % |
|-----------|----|-----|
| Agree | 17 | 53% |
| Disagree | 12 | 37% |
| No answer | 3 | 9% |

Comment (1 received in response to this question):

- Transparency is good in this circumstance as academic administrators are employed at the pleasure of their supervisors, not faculty

No narrative comments were offered in response to this question.

Question 6. In contrast, the *Plan* and/or the bylaws-under-construction could be amended/written to stipulate that the evaluation results should be distributed to the Faculty Assembly in summary form.

| Responses | 31 | % |
|-----------|----|-----|
| Agree | 18 | 58% |
| Disagree | 7 | 23% |
| No answer | 6 | 19% |

Question 7. Was the time period for response (originally three weeks, from distribution on Mon. Feb. 10 through Mon. 3 Mar., then extended through Mon. Mar. 10, 2014) sufficient to complete the survey?

| Responses | 32 | % |
|-----------|----|------|
| Yes | 32 | 100% |
| No | 0 | 0% |
| No answer | 0 | 0% |

No narrative comments were offered in response to this question.

Question 8. In the space below, please add any other comments you have regarding the AY 2013-2014 evaluation instrument or the evaluation process. Please use an additional sheet of paper for further comments if desired.

- While more specific commentary should still be available to the evaluatee(s) and supervisors only, some way to report on overall findings would be appropriate and would add to the sense of accountability
- As with all surveys – I think an answer option should be – “no opportunity to assess this item”.
- The faculty assembly should also receive plans/steps that the provost/SVP/CEO will take to address the feedback in the evaluation of the provost
- I think the by-laws should be amended to include organizational structure issues, e.g. achieving goals in the best interests of students
- Thank you for all the work you did

- The evaluation process is a waste of time if it changes nothing
- My responses here would mean more to me if this evaluation had been conducted right after the survey. Also, I have concerns about my survey responses being edited too much.
- Good job – It would appear the position (provost) needs a job description with which to base evaluation on. Also, when, how, who evaluates chairs and now interim Deans?
- The committee did a good job in difficult circumstances
- Not sure what will be gained from the process – if the supervisor is not looking for input from the faculty, then what weight will it carry?

Committee conclusions, February 2015

- The Evaluation of the Evaluation Process brings the 2014 evaluation process to its conclusion.
- In order to continue its function and begin a new evaluation cycle, the existing committee determines that several components need to be determined for the merged institution, namely:
 - The precise list of administrators with academic purviews for the institution and for the individual locations (a preview was given at the Feb. 5, 2015 Spring Campus Address; requests for more formal confirmation of this list have been made).
 - The exact nature of SUNY-Poly Governance, to determine whether and how (membership, bylaws, etc.) there would be one evaluation committee with representation from both sites, evaluation committees at the local campuses that focus on academic administrators whose purviews are specific to those locations, but who collaborate on evaluating academic administrators with responsibilities for both locations, or some other design for the committee to function for the purpose of providing professional evaluation of academic administrators.
 - Narrative comments from this survey indicate some interest in reconfiguring the purpose and purview of this committee, but more input should be solicited from the faculty at both locations as part of the process of drafting committee bylaws and making any changes to either the Utica location Faculty Assembly bylaws or the as-yet-unfinalized SUNY-Poly Governance Council Bylaws are made.
- The existing, active membership of the committee considers itself unable to proceed in any more than a theoretical capacity until these details are clarified.