



I. 3.9.1 Evaluation of Academic Administrators

Chapter 3 - Faculty	Original Effective Date: February 2000
Section: 3.9 Evaluation of Academic Administrators	Date Last Reviewed: March 2012
Responsible Entity: Vice President for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs	Date Last Revised: March 2012

II. Purpose

To establish the requirements and standard process for evaluation of all Academic Administrators of UT Health San Antonio.

III. Scope

This policy applies to Academic Administrators and the current and future committees appointed to evaluate their performance.

IV. Policy

A. General Policy

The University of Texas Board of Regents for many years has mandated evaluation of the Chief Administrative Officer of each component institution by the Vice Presidents and Deans. In addition, the Board has now mandated that each academic administrator below the level of Chief Administrative Officer should be reviewed at least every six years, and that faculty shall be provided an opportunity for input into the reviews of other administrators who have significant impacts on campus academic affairs. The Regents' Rules and Regulations, [Rule 31101](#), state further that the review process should provide an opportunity for input by all faculty members in the academic unit(s) directly reporting to and/or affected directly by the administrator being evaluated. The term "Academic Administrator" is intended to refer to the Chief Academic Officer, academic Deans, department Chairs, and Directors of academic units

Because the Regents' Rules and Regulations also require the periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty, including Academic Administrators who have faculty appointments with tenure, it is proposed that the evaluation of administrators at UT Health San Antonio (UTHSA) occur in conjunction with post tenure review for those Academic Administrators who have faculty appointments with tenure. It is intended that a single review occurs complying with all evaluation requirements.

3.9.1 Evaluation of Academic Administrators

B. Process

It is intended that the evaluation of administrators who have faculty appointments with tenure be a parallel process to that approved for post tenure review. As a result, these evaluations shall be scheduled in at least five-year intervals, but may be scheduled at more frequent intervals at the discretion of each School, with approval from the Vice President for Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs. Administrators who are subject to evaluation will be randomly selected by a process established by each School so that approximately 20 percent of each School's administrators are reviewed each year over a five-year period.

The process of evaluation of Deans and Chairs shall be conducted by each School. If a rigorous process for evaluation of these administrators already exists, the existing process may be used to comply with this policy, with approval from the Vice President for Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs. In the event that a rigorous evaluation process exists but does not include a means for all faculty reporting to and/or affected directly by the administrator being evaluated to provide input into process, then the process shall be revised to provide such input before the Vice President approves using the existing process. If the existing evaluation process does not assure that a summary of faculty input constitutes a significant component of the evaluation report of the administrator, then the existing process must be revised to provide for the inclusion of the summary of faculty input in the evaluation report.

If no evaluation process exists for a School, the Dean shall develop a process that may include the appointment of an evaluation committee. The committee should include the following representation from the School: two part-time or full-time faculty members and two current administrators. Members of the committee will serve a three-year term with one-third of the committee rotating off each year. Administrators and faculty members who are scheduled for periodic evaluation are not eligible to serve that year on the committee. The Dean also shall select from outside the School one Chair or other administrator, who will serve a term of one year. The evaluation committee (or Dean, if appropriate) must provide a means for soliciting input from all faculty members in the academic unit(s) reporting to and/or affected directly by the administrator (e.g., using an appraisal/evaluation survey or questionnaire). The summary of the input from all faculty must constitute a significant component of the evaluation report prepared by the evaluation committee. A summary of faculty input in the evaluation process must be provided to the administrator under review and to the administrator's supervisor.

Administrators who have faculty appointments with tenure can anticipate scheduled evaluations at least every five years from the initial year of their administrative appointment. Deans will notify the administrators of the evaluations at least six months in advance. At the beginning of each academic year, the committee shall be informed of the administrators who are scheduled for evaluation so that materials can be submitted and reviewed during the following Spring semester.

The Dean shall provide the committee with past years' evaluations of the administrator including a statement of major responsibilities and an assessment of the level of

3.9.1 Evaluation of Academic Administrators

performance. Any additional information that would aid in the evaluation should also be included. It is the responsibility of the administrator to provide the following information to the committee:

1. current Curriculum Vita; and
2. a statement supporting the fulfillment of major responsibilities with appropriate documentation.

The administrator will be provided with the opportunity to meet with the committee upon request.

A written report of the evaluation will be forwarded by the Chair of the evaluation committee to the administrator two weeks before it is sent to the Dean and Vice President. The report will contain one of the following performance ratings: Satisfactory Performance, Marginal Performance, or Unsatisfactory Performance.

1. Satisfactory Performance: for those administrators performing at a level that is consistent with the expectations of their School.
2. Marginal Performance: for those administrators whose performance indicates that they would benefit from additional institutional support, the review may be used to provide assistance in developing administrative management skills. Administrators who receive a recommendation of “Marginal Performance” will be expected to seek remedial aid and 24 months later submit their credentials for re-evaluation.
3. Unsatisfactory Performance: for those administrators whose performance is deemed unsatisfactory, review by the President to determine whether to notify them that they no longer will serve in their administrative role. Administrators serve at the pleasure of the President so there is no need for a good cause determination.

C. Monitoring the Process

The responsibility for overseeing the process of evaluation of administrators with tenure will be shared by the Vice President for Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs and the Deans.

V. Definitions

There are no defined terms used in this Policy.

VI. Related References

There are no related documents associated with this Policy.

VII. Review and Approval History

The approving authority of this policy is the University Executive Committee.

Effective Date	Action Taken	Approved By	Approved Date
----------------	--------------	-------------	---------------

3.9.1 Evaluation of Academic Administrators

02/2000	Policy Origination		
03/2012	Policy Review		