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3.2.10 The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators on a periodic basis. (Administrative staff evaluations)

Compliance Status: Compliance

Administrators at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, including the president, are evaluated on a periodic basis. System Policy 02.05, Presidents of System Member Universities, [1] provides that the president is to "conduct regular periodic evaluations of each administrative officer." The president generally delegates these reviews to the administrator's immediate supervisor. System regulation 33.99.03, Performance Evaluations for Nonfaculty Employees, [2] requires that "the performance of nonfaculty employees of the Texas A&M University System, except graduate assistants, student workers and temporary employees, will be evaluated each year" and further specifies that "the purpose of employee performance evaluations is to inform employees of the quality of their work, to identify those areas needing improvement, set specific objectives for employees, and provide an opportunity to discuss career goals and the support needed to meet those goals. Performance evaluations also assist department heads and managers in evaluating their work force, identifying employee potential, and establishing priorities for training, education, compensation and reward."

University Rule 33.99.03.C1, Performance Evaluation for Administrators and Nonfaculty Employees, [3] further specifies that a purpose of the reviews is to "promote the establishment of performance expectations and goals that are consistent with institutional goals." University Procedure 33.99.03.C1.02, Performance Evaluation for Nonfaculty Employees Excluding Administrators, [4] provides details regarding the skills upon which administrators will be evaluated, including the ability to think strategically, analyze issues, use sound judgment, establish plans' develop systems and processes, manage effectively, provide direction, lead decisively, influence others, foster teamwork, give specific and constructive feedback, champion change, build relationships with direct reports, colleagues and supervisors, champion the recruitment and promotion of people from diverse backgrounds, communicate effectively, achieve results, act with integrity, demonstrate adaptability, use financial/quantitative data productively, and focus on the needs of their respective constituencies.

President
System Policy 01.03, Appointing Power and Terms and Conditions of Employment, [5] requires that the board of regents review the chief executive officers annually. The chancellor begins the process by requiring a written review of the past year's accomplishments [6] [7] [8] as well as a compact with the system [9], which includes specific targets for achievement [10] [11]. The chancellor meets annually with the president to discuss these documents and also meets annually with the board of regents to evaluate the president [12].

Nonacademic Administrators
Annual evaluation of nonacademic administrators, at or above the level of director, as discussed above in University Procedure 33.99.03.C1.02, Performance Evaluation of Administrators [4], requires that administrators and their supervisors "review the institutional goals and make sure that their particular units have established goals that are congruent with the university goals." Human resources provides a form for performance appraisal of exempt (non-classified) employees [13]. Each vice president is responsible for collecting information on the evaluation process in his or her division.

The president annually evaluates his direct administrative reports. Each administrator completes a report [14] [15] that includes an analysis of completion of the previous year's goals, which are linked to the strategic plan, and goals for the coming year. This report is discussed in a face-to-face meeting with the president [16]. In spring 2009, members of the President's Cabinet, including the president, also participated in a "360-degree evaluation," which involved review by the president, peers and direct reports. Each participant debriefed with the consultant and with the president and was required by the president to submit a report detailing areas of strength, areas needing a development plan, and a development plan [17]. Evaluations of administrative officers are kept in the Office of the President.

Academic Administrators

Academic administrators, like all University employees, are evaluated annually by their supervisors. Sample evaluations of deans, department chairs and the library director by their supervisors are included [18] [19] [20] [21] [22].

University Procedure 33.99.03.C1.03, Performance Reviews of Academic Administrators [23], provides further direction for review of academic administrators. As part of the evaluation process for academic administrators, their supervisors seek input from the appropriate academic constituencies about the effectiveness of the administrator under review. Questionnaires that are approved by Faculty Senate and customized for evaluation of department chairs, assistant or associate deans, deans, the graduate dean, and the library director (by both library staff and faculty) are used [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [29]. This year, to both ensure security and anonymity of reviewers, the process was changed to utilize WebCT [30]. Participants are sent instructions via e-mail on how to log into WebCT and access the surveys. Results [31] [32] [33] [34] [35] [36] are tabulated and returned to the individual who was reviewed who then meets with his or her supervisor (the provost or a dean) to discuss.

University Procedure 33.99.03.C1.03 [23] lays out the schedule for periodic reviews by academic constituencies of academic administrators, and a matrix detailing review dates is kept [37]. Academic department chairs are reviewed by their respective faculties annually. College deans are reviewed every two years by their faculties. Directors and assistant/associate directors are reviewed every two years by their respective staff members. The director of the library is reviewed by the librarians and paraprofessionals every two years. Associate/assistant deans, depending on their portfolios, are reviewed every two years by the appropriate staff and/or faculty. All of these reviews are coordinated by the Office of the Provost.

Faculty Senate coordinates the review of the provost. The provost is reviewed every three years by individuals reporting directly to the provost as well as by members of the Faculty Senate and
members of the Academic Council during that three-year period. More frequent reviews may be requested and conducted. The provost discusses the results of his or her review with the Faculty Senate.

Conclusion
As described in Texas A&M University System policies and regulations and Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi rules and procedures, Texas A&M-Corpus Christi evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators, including the chief executive officer, on a periodic basis. The reviews ensure the quality of leadership at the University and provide the administrative officers with information for improving their work and that of their offices to better serve the University.

Evidence

- BD 027 TAMUS 02-05 Presidents of System Member Universities
- BD 143 TAMUS 33-99-03 Performance Evaluations for Nonfaculty Employees
- UD 1014 AMCC 33-99-03-C1 Performance Evaluation for Administrators and Nonfaculty Employees
- UD 634 AMCC 33-99-03-C1-02 Performance Evaluation of Administrators
- BD 069 TAMUS 01-03 Appointing Power and Terms and Conditions of Employment
- CO 080 McKinney Review Request 2008
- CO 081 McKinney Review Request for FK 2007
- CO 082 McKinney Review Request for FK 2009
- BD 156 Compact as CEO Evaluation documentation
- UD 566 TAMUCC Compact FY08-FY09 Final
- UD 706 TAMU-CC Compact Update 2008
- CO 083 McKinney letter confirming eval of FK
- CD 923 Evaluation Form Exempt
- CD 951 Sample 360 Report Follow up Plan
- CD 952 Sample Division Report for Evaluation of VP
- CD 953 Trent Hill Sample Division Report
- UD 1132 fk request for eval docs to pc
- CD 954 First Sample Division Report and Development Plan
- CD 955 Downward Abdelsamad - perf eval 2008
- CD 956 Downward BonnetteRandy eval2007-2008
- CD 957 Downward DC GronJack eval2008
- CD 958 Downward Dean Pezold - perf eval 2008 by provost
- CD 959 Downward Lib Director Shupala - perf eval 2008
- UD 719 TAMUCC 33.99.03.C1.03
- CD 960 Survey Instrument Assistant-Associate Dean Evaluation Spr 2009
- CD 961 Survey Instrument Dean Evaluation Spr 2009
- CD 962 Survey Instrument Department Chair Evaluation Spr 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 963</td>
<td>Survey Instrument Graduate Dean Evaluation Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 964</td>
<td>Survey Instrument Library Director Evaluation by Faculty Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 965</td>
<td>Survey Instrument Library Director Evaluation by Library Staff 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD 1133</td>
<td>WebCT for Upward Evaluation Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 966</td>
<td>Upward COB Dean Moustafa Abdelsamad Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 967</td>
<td>Upward DC MKTG Leon Dube Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 968</td>
<td>Upward Graduate Dean Harvey Knull Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 969</td>
<td>Upward Library Director by Faculty Christine Shupala Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 970</td>
<td>Upward Library Director by Lib Staff Christine Shupala Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 971</td>
<td>Upward DC Teacher Education Martin Ward Spr 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD 1134</td>
<td>Dean Evaluation Cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>