Overview
Every Fall, as part of the campuswide Annual Review Process, a Faculty and Staff Evaluation of Administrators (FSEA) shall be conducted by full-time faculty and staff at Kennesaw State University in order to evaluate the managerial effectiveness of academic administrators. These evaluations will supplement and inform the existing review procedures for chairs, deans, and the Provost. The exact dates for each cycle will be developed, announced and posted on the Academic Affairs webpage by the Provost or his/her designee, in cooperation with the Faculty and Staff Evaluation of Administrators Committee (FSEAC) Chair. The evaluation and review process shall embrace shared governance principles as articulate by AAUP. “The most effective systems of administrator evaluation are those that occur periodically as part of a collaborative endeavor involving the faculty, the administration, other campus constituencies with a stake in the outcome, and the individual under review. The system should be not only periodic (as affecting the individual) but also regular, that is, part of the institutional structure, rather than being triggered on an ad hoc basis that requires the reinvention of the wheel for each separate review.” (http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/FacultyEvaluationof+Admins.htm).

The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs or his/her designee, in cooperation with the FSEAC Chair, is responsible for initiating and managing the FSEA within the units under Academic Affairs each year. All permanent, full-time faculty and staff reporting to the administrator will receive the FSEA instrument and be encouraged to participate. All permanent full-time faculty and staff will have the opportunity to contribute to the evaluation of the Provost. All permanent full-time-college faculty and staff will have the opportunity to contribute to the evaluation of the college’s dean. All full-time permanent departmental/school faculty and staff will have the opportunity to contribute to the evaluation of the department chair or school director. Only those Administrators who have been in their positions for at least one academic year must participate in this evaluation. Those who have been in their positions less than one year and desire feedback may elect to participate.

Only contractors approved by the FSEAC will be eligible to administer the FSEA instrument. Evaluation participants will only be known to the contractor handling the evaluation. Data from the FSEA will be compiled by question with quantitative questions compiled using frequencies of each response, and qualitative questions compiled by randomly sorting responses and then reporting all responses verbatim. At the conclusion of each FSEA, the quantitative and qualitative data shall be deposited in the KSU archives. In consultation with the relevant review

---

1 The Process Review Committee (PRC) discussed decreasing the frequency of the FSEA, but determined that routinizing the process, as well as attaining regular documented feedback of administrative performance, was the most effective way to ensure faculty and staff participation and impact on the review process.
2 PRC discussed proposal to include part-timers on 4/7/14. PRC determined that an adequate list could not be coordinated, and that part-timers do not generally have enough relevant experience with reviewees to be included as reviewers.
3 PRC agreed on 4/7/14 that the Burruss Institute should be allowed to bid for five year contract that will begin in Fall 2015. However, further exploration of faculty worries should take place before any bid is accepted, and PRC/FSEAC should decide whether costs savings are worth using KSU affiliated body.
committee, the relevant supervisor may redact any comments/data that could identify individuals not under review or any unsubstantiated actionable claims.4

The FSEA is intended to supplement the existing academic administrative review procedures with a faculty/staff evaluation component; they are not designed to replace existing procedures. The FSEA is intended to enhance transparency, increase faculty and staff confidence in the integrity of the academic administrative review process, and create a more robust academic administrative review process that takes into account faculty and staff perspectives and knowledge regarding (among other things) program delivery, curriculum development, policy development and implementation, and university leadership. Therefore, the procedures outlined in this document shall be followed by all academic units across campus.

Three principles shall guide all reviews:

1. The review process shall be fully transparent.
2. The results of the review process that are related to faculty and staff evaluation of administrators shall be made available for review to the faculty and staff.
3. The review shall include a structure to assure open communication/dialog among the participants about the process and the results.

**FSEA Questions**

The FSEAC Chair, in consultation with the FSEAC and the contractor, shall be responsible for organizing and updating the evaluation instrument. FSEA questions will include, but not be limited to, those found in Appendix 1. Colleges, departments and other units are encouraged to include additional evaluation questions as deemed appropriate. Department Faculty Councils (DFC) may consult with their respective chairs, as well as faculty and staff, to prepare additional questions for the evaluation, and College Faculty Councils (CFC) may consult with their respective deans, faculty and staff. The administrator being evaluated may also suggest additional questions for the evaluation. Likewise, the FSEC may follow the same process with the Provost and others for whom they serve as the FSEA Review Committee (see below). The FSEAC Chair shall solicit requests from these stakeholders at the beginning of each academic year, if feasible. The supervisor of the administrator being evaluated will make the final determination of the questions if the administrator and his/her advisory committee (DFC/CFC/FSEC) cannot agree.

The FSEA applies only to Department Chairs/School Directors, degree granting College Deans, and the Provost. Other academic administrators, such as graduate directors and assistant/associate Chairs/Deans are not evaluated separately in the FSEA. There will be specific questions within each evaluation that ask faculty and staff to comment generally on the performance of these individuals, as part of their supervisor’s managerial performance. However, individual academic units are encouraged to develop, if the DFC/CFC/FSEC deems

---

4 PRC discussed how to include qualitative metrics in the KSU archives on 4/7/14. PRC agreed that there should be opportunities to exclude information that would identify individuals not relevant to the specific reviewee. The relevant review committee and supervisor should identify such information to be redacted with each supervisor making final determination.
appropriate, separate evaluation metrics and processes for those administrators.\textsuperscript{5} In addition, the President is encouraged to expand the FSEA model to other KSU units outside of Academic Affairs, such as the Library faculty and staff.\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{5} PRC discussed including other administrators on 4/7/14 and agreed that they should be incorporated into the review instrument, but not be evaluated separately. However, DFCs and CFCs are encouraged to lobby their own units to conduct evaluations separate from the FSEA if desired.
  \item \textsuperscript{6} PRC discussed including library faculty in the FSEA, but given that they are outside of Academic Affairs, concluded that their inclusion in the FSEA was not appropriate or feasible.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition and/or role in FSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Evaluation of Administrators</td>
<td>FSEA</td>
<td>Evaluation system through which full-time faculty and staff provide quantitative and qualitative evaluations of academic administrators at KSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Evaluation of Administrators Committee</td>
<td>FSEAC</td>
<td>Campuswide committee charged with reviewing and implementing FSEA. The FSEAC will consist of the Provost, the FSEAC Chair, the members of the FSEC, one representative appointed by the Staff Senate, one representative appointed by the Administrative Senate, two representatives from the Dean’s Council, two representatives from the Chair’s Council, one member selected by the Faculty Senate (but not necessarily a Senator) who is well informed about the review process and can provide “institutional memory” regarding the evolution of the review process (two year term), the Associate Vice President for Faculty, and the Faculty Executive Assistant to the President. Ideally the Staff and Administrative Senate members will come from Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSEAC Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of FSEAC appointed by FSEC. FSEAC Coordinator works with Academic Affairs to implement annual FSEA throughout Kennesaw State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>FSEC</td>
<td>Executive Committee of the KSU Faculty Senate. This body sits on the FSEAC, selects the FSEAC Chair, and three members sit on the PERC. The FSEC President should oversee the election of faculty and staff members of PERC by October 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Faculty Council</td>
<td>DFC</td>
<td>Group of faculty selected by each department according to department bylaws, from which three faculty members of DERC are selected. DFC Chair should oversee election of faculty and staff members of DERC by October 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Evaluation Review Committee</td>
<td>DERC</td>
<td>Composed of three tenured faculty members elected by and from the DFC, and one staff member selected from and by the staff in the Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERC Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of DERC selected by its members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty Council</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Group of faculty selected by each college according to college bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Evaluation Review Committee</td>
<td>CERC</td>
<td>Composed of three tenured faculty elected from and by the CFC, and one staff representative elected from and by the staff in the Office of the Dean of that college. CFC Chair should oversee election of faculty and staff members of CERC by October 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERC Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of CERC selected by its members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Review Committee</td>
<td>PERC</td>
<td>Composed of three tenured faculty elected from and by the FSEC, and one staff member from the Office of the Provost, elected by and from the Provost’s office staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERC Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of the PERC selected by its members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic administrator (Chair, Dean, Provost) who is reviewed in a separate review instrument, each with their own relevant review committee (DERC, CERC, or PERC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>The relevant supervisor for a specific administrative review. In all cases will be a Dean (for Chairs and School Directors) the Provost (for all Deans) and the President (for the Provost).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent, full-time faculty as determined by departments and Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent, full-time faculty as determined by departments and Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of University Professors</td>
<td>AAUP</td>
<td>Faculty organization that locally at KSU and nationally advocates on behalf of shared governance. AAUP principles guide the KSU Faculty and Staff Evaluation of Administrators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Participants in the KSU Faculty and Staff Evaluation of Administrators
**Review Committee Composition**
The composition of the specific review committees can be found in the table below:

**Table 2. Reporting Relationships and Review Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewee/Administrator</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Evaluation Review Committee*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs and School Directors</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Department Evaluation Review Committee (DERC)-Three tenured faculty elected from and by the members of the DFC, and one staff member elected by the Department Staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans (Degree Granting Colleges)</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>College Evaluation Review Committee (CERC)-Three tenured faculty elected from and by the members of the CFC, and one staff member elected by the staff in the Office of the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, College of Continuing and Professional Education (CCPE)</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>College Evaluation Review Committee (CERC)-One Academic Affairs representative from the Administrative Senate, one Academic Affairs member from the Staff Senate, and one staff representative from the CCPE, elected by and from CCPE staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Provost Evaluation Review Committee (PERC)-Three tenured faculty elected from and by the members of the FSEC, and one staff representative from the Office of the Provost, elected by and from the Provost’s staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Or “alternative body” as specified in Section Three: Shared Governance and Committees of KSU of the Faculty Handbook. If there are not three tenured faculty on the DFC/CFC/FSEC to serve on the Review Committee, additional members will be elected by the DFC/CFC/FSEC from the department/college/Faculty Senate, respectively. If a department does not have three tenured faculty members, the administrator’s supervisor will appoint additional tenured faculty members from other department(s) in the college to fill the department's FSE Review Committee. If a department or Office of the Dean has fewer than three full-time, permanent staff members, staff representation is optional as determined by vote of the staff in that Department/Office of the Dean. DFC/CFC/FSEC Chairs are responsible for coordinating election/selection of faculty members and staff members of relevant Review Committee and reporting their names and emails to FSEAC Chair by October 15 of each Fall.

**Faculty and Staff Evaluation of Administrators Committee (FSEAC) Composition**
The FSEAC shall serve as an advisory body to the Provost/ Vice-President for Academic Affairs in the regular implementation of the FSEA. Additionally, the FSEAC shall solicit input from stakeholders and review the entire FSEA procedures no less than once every five years.

The FSEAC will consist of the Provost, the FSEAC chair (appointed by the FSEC – see below), the members of the FSEAC, one representative appointed by the Staff Senate, one representative appointed by the Administrative Senate, two representatives from the Dean’s Council, two representatives from the Chair’s Council, one member selected by the Faculty Senate (but not necessarily a Senator) who is well informed about the evaluation process and can provide “institutional memory” regarding the evolution of the review process (two year term), the Associate Vice President for Faculty, and the Faculty Executive Assistant to the President. Representatives from the Staff and Administrative Senates should ideally hold positions in Academic Affairs.

The FSEAC Coordinator shall be a tenured faculty member selected by the FSEC. That individual may be a member of the FSEC, but need not be. The FSEAC Coordinator will be

---

7 PRC discussed including Chairs/Deans to serve on review committees, but determined their presence would alter the dynamic of faculty/staff participation, and that there were other, more appropriate avenues for lower level administrators to advocate for their perspective.
responsible for notifying FSEAC members of their responsibilities and for managing meetings and FSEA reviews. In addition to these tasks the Coordinator will partner with the assigned administrator in Academic Affairs to facilitate the overall FSEA. In particular, the Coordinator will work with DERC/CERC/PERCs to ensure that committee members have been identified and reported to college election officers as well as Academic Affairs. In concert with the assigned administrator, the FSEAC Coordinator will also see to it that current FSEA procedures are made available to the review committees and will answer questions from them regarding such procedures and processes. The FSEAC Coordinator shall work with Academic Affairs to ensure appropriate contractors are chosen and to communicate with survey contractors about distribution of evaluation data. They will develop an FSEA Timeline for posting on the Academic Affairs website each Fall by October 15. They will generally serve as the liaison for all faculty and staff on campus about the FSEA.

All changes made in the FSEA since its initiation shall be reviewed by all three Senates in light of the experience of the reviews to date, and all future changes in the administrative review process recommended by the FSEA (or by any other body) shall be vetted by the Staff Senate, Administrative Senate, and Faculty Senates before submission to the Provost/VPAA for implementation.
APPENDIX 1: Survey instrument

Note: This is the “shortened” survey instrument created by Andy Pieper and Ken White per the instructions of the PRC on 4/17/14. It is a draft only. We have reduced the number of “sections” from 18 to 11, and also reduced the number of measures in some sections. We also moved the “Insufficient Observation” option to the beginning of the options from the end of the options. Please contact Andy with any further reductions/suggestions to this instrument.

FSEA Survey Instrument: Revised Spring 2014 (proposal)

Rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on the following items. These items describe managerial competencies, behaviors and outcomes. Feel free to leave comments, but note that all comments will be available in verbatim format and provided to that administrator. Not all items may apply to your relationship with this administrator. If you do not have this type of experience with the administrator, then select "Insufficient Observation." Use the following scale for each question:

Insufficient Observation-Insufficient observations to evaluate behavior
 Very Effective-Almost always demonstrates this set of behaviors
  Effective-Usually demonstrates this set of behaviors
 Somewhat Effective-Sometimes demonstrates this set of behaviors
 Ineffective-Almost never demonstrates this set of behaviors

1. Vision, Goals, and Advocacy
Please rate the effectiveness of [ADMINISTRATOR] on the following areas related to setting and implementing vision and goals:

Communicates a vision and goals that build upon the vision and goals of the [DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE/ ACADEMIC AFFAIRS]

Identifies practical strategies for achieving the visions and goals of the [DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE/ ACADEMIC AFFAIRS]

Implements goals and strategies with appropriate levels of input and support from faculty and staff

Advocates to obtain needed resources and favorable decisions from the University's administration and from appropriate external constituents (e.g., prospective students, professional societies, accrediting agencies, state and local organizations and sources for external funding):

Please add any additional comments:

2. Setting Standards of Performance
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in communicating clear, specific and appropriate standards of performance for faculty and staff at various career stages on the following aspects:

Teaching
Supervising and Mentoring
Students Research and Creative Activity
Professional Service

Please add any additional comments:

3. Professional Development
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in encouraging, supporting and providing resources for the professional development of faculty/staff in the following aspects:

Teaching, Supervising and Mentoring of Students
Research and Creative Activity
Professional Service
Staff and Student assistants

Please add any additional comments:

4. Tenure and Promotion Decisions
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in:

Following tenure and promotion/post--tenure review guidelines
Collecting sufficient information to make informed personnel decisions

Please add any additional comments:

5. Interpersonal Relationships
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in:

Demonstrating an understanding of the needs and concerns of faculty, staff and students
Treating everyone with respect
Being open and accessible to all

Please add any additional comments:

6. Problem Solving and Conflict Resolution
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in problem solving and conflict resolution in the following areas:
Demonstrating awareness of current problems and conflicts
Taking appropriate steps to resolve problems and conflicts
Working proactively to reduce future problems or conflicts
Please add any additional comments

7. Student Relations
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness regarding relations with student in the following areas:
Providing sufficient direction and support for student advisement, career planning and placement and student organizations within the [DEPARTMENT/ COLLEGE/ ACADEMIC AFFAIRS]
Providing sufficient direction and support for handling student complaints

8. Principles and Integrity
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in the following areas:
Taking a principled and informed stance on matters of concern to the [DEPARTMENT/ COLLEGE/ ACADEMIC AFFAIRS]
Demonstrating integrity/fairness when interacting with others (e.g., in scheduling classes and other work assignments, allocating resources, handling conflicts, responding to requests in a timely manner)
Please add any additional comments:

9. Diversity
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in the following areas:
Demonstrating commitment to advancing and supporting equal employment opportunities
Demonstrating sensitivity to diversity and equity concerns of faculty, staff and students
Please add any additional comments:

10. Governance
Please rate [ADMINISTRATOR] on his/her effectiveness in administering the business of the DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE/ACADEMIC AFFAIRS:
Demonstrating commitment to principles and practice of shared governance
Planning and conducting regularly scheduled Unit meetings
Monitoring and addressing deficiencies in program effectiveness/resourcefulness (i.e., assessment of student learning; needs of students and the community; Academic Program Improvement and assessment; accreditation requirements)

Please add any additional comments:

11. Overall Effectiveness

Please rate the overall effectiveness of [ADMINISTRATOR]

Please add any additional comments: