Review of Academic Administrators Policy

Purpose:
Faculty participation in the ongoing formative evaluation of academic administrators is critical to nurturing a mutual commitment by both the faculty and the administration to the success of an institution. This policy describes the means by which the faculty of California State University Maritime Academy (Cal Maritime), through the Academic Senate, will engage in the evaluation of academic administrators.

Scope:
This policy applies to academic administrative employees appointed on a permanent or interim, but not acting, basis to administrative positions involving significant supervision of faculty and/or significant influence over curricular or other academic issues.

Accountability:
The Chair of the Academic Senate and the Administrator Review Committee are responsible for administering this policy and ensuring compliance.

Policy:
It is the policy of Cal Maritime, through the Academic Senate, that faculty shall evaluate academic administrators every three years.
Procedure:

A. Academic Administrators at Cal Maritime to be reviewed are:
   1. Provost
   2. School Deans
   3. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
   4. Library Dean
   5. The Director of Marine Programs and/or anyone serving as Captain of the Training Ship (COTS)

B. Permanent, Interim, and/or Acting Appointees
   Only permanent or interim, but not acting, appointees to these positions shall be reviewed. An acting appointment is a temporary appointment to fill a temporary vacancy due to absence, illness or other reason, when it is anticipated the permanent administrator will return to his or her duties. Acting appointees shall not generally be reviewed in the temporary position.

   An interim appointee shall be evaluated per this policy if such interim appointment exceeds two consecutive years. Captains of the training ship other than the Director of Marine Programs are considered “interim” employees for the purpose of this policy.

   Other academic administrative positions involving significant supervision of faculty and/or significant influence over curricular or academic issues may be added to the list above by making amendments to this policy. At any time, however, the President may request, in writing to the Academic Senate Chair, the review of a permanent or interim administrator not included in this list, but meeting the general criterion stated above.

C. Administrator Review Committee
   Reviews shall be conducted by the Administrator Review Committee (ARC), a Standing Committee of the Academic Senate. This Committee shall consist of five elected faculty, either tenured faculty or lecturers with three-year appointment status. Of the five, one shall be elected from within each School, and two among the Senate faculty at large. After an initial year where all five are elected, the elections shall occur staggered over a three-year cycle. This cycle shall be phased in by a process determined by the Senate Executive Committee during initial implementation of this policy. Once the cycle is phased in, all elected ARC faculty members shall serve three-year terms. Elections shall occur during the spring semester for service beginning in the subsequent academic year. At the beginning of each fall semester, the ARC shall elect one of its members to serve as Chair of the Committee for that academic year.

   The Chair of the ARC, in consultation with the Senate Chair and the President, shall maintain a list of academic administrators (see the list above), their appointment dates, the dates of any previous reviews, and a schedule for their reviews. The reviews shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth below.

D. Review Procedures
   1. The review shall commence in the first fall semester after completion of an administrator’s second full year of employment in the applicable position, or, in the case of captains of the training ship other than the Director of Marine Programs, after the second consecutive appointment to the position. Additional reviews shall be conducted every third year thereafter. The Senate Executive Committee, with approval of the President, may initiate additional, interim reviews of an academic administrator covered by this policy at any time.
2. For purposes of initial implementation of this policy, the ARC Chair, in consultation with the Senate Chair and President, shall generate a list of academic administrators, a description of the duties of their position and a proposed schedule for their review. This proposed schedule shall be presented to the President for approval. New academic administrators shall be added to the schedule when appointed.

3. On or before the end of the third week of the fall semester, the ARC Chair shall notify the academic administrators scheduled for review in the current academic year of the timeline for review. Each administrator scheduled for review shall be invited to submit a statement reflecting on their prior reviews (if any), accomplishments, leadership effectiveness, strengths, weaknesses, and future plans. The administrator shall be given three weeks to submit this statement.

4. The ARC Chair shall issue the appropriate survey from the appendix to the faculty via an online survey platform. The administrator’s job description and reflective statement (if any) shall accompany the survey. All faculty shall be invited to complete the survey. Faculty shall be given three weeks to complete the survey. All responses shall be anonymous.

5. The ARC shall collate the received feedback. This shall include statistical values for the numerical questions and a list of all written responses. The written comments may be grouped or reformatted for ease of reading. In particular, where appropriate, and where anonymity can be reasonably ensured, scores and comments may be grouped according to groups of faculty, established by the gatekeeping questions of the survey, that are most directly under the supervision of the administrator. Received comments may be edited, if necessary, to ensure anonymity; however, no comments shall be omitted.

6. In addition, the ARC shall draft a report which i) objectively summarizes the results of the survey, and ii) based on this report, makes recommendations to the administrator for improvement in performance.

7. The ARC shall meet with the administrator to share the collated data and draft report. The administrator shall be given an opportunity to provide input and/or correct errors of fact in their draft report.

8. The ARC shall then finalize their report and send it, attached with the collated data, to the administrator. This shall occur by the end of the fall semester. The administrator shall have three weeks from the beginning of the spring semester to write an optional response or rebuttal statement.

9. The ARC report, collated data, and administrator’s response (if any) shall be forwarded to the administrator’s immediate supervisor (Provost or President, depending on the administrative position), and (in the case where the supervisor is the Provost) the President as well. The supervisor shall be invited to write a response which shall be attached to the review. He/she shall be given three weeks to provide a response.

10. The ARC Chair shall present the review (to include the ARC report, and any administrator’s response) to the Senate Executive Committee at a closed-door Senate Executive Committee meeting. After review of the ARC report, the Senate Executive Committee shall open the meeting to the administrator’s supervisor to discuss findings. No written or electronic record shall be distributed at this meeting. This discussion shall remain confidential to this group, and while the occurrence of this discussion shall appear in the minutes of the meeting, its contents shall not. This meeting shall occur by the end of March.

11. Strict confidentiality shall be maintained; no information about the review shall be shared beyond the ARC, the Senate Executive Committee, the Provost or President.
12. Copies of the administrator reviews shall be maintained in the Office of the President. Members of the Senate Executive Committee shall be permitted to see a prior review of an administrator upon request.
Faculty Review of Academic Administrator Survey

Dear Respondent,

This survey is part of California State University, Maritime Academy’s Administration Evaluation Policy process. Please take a few minutes to complete this brief evaluation for the Administrator named below.

Please answer each question to the best of your abilities. Feel free to provide additional information in the comment boxes provided after each section of the survey. The comments will be shared with the reviewed administrator, their supervisor, and the Evaluation Committee. All comments will remain anonymous. The Administration Review Committee will preserve the anonymity of all the respondents while collating the data.

Before filling out the survey, please review the administrator’s job description and their self-study statement. When you have completed the survey, please select the "Submit" button at the bottom of your screen to submit your results. Otherwise, your results will not be saved.

Your feedback is greatly appreciated. We encourage you to explain your choices in the comment boxes provided below each section. Thank you for your time and participation.

Name of the Administrator

Job Title

Job Description & Duties

Link to Administrator’s Self Study
1) How many times have you interacted in-person with this administrator in the last year?  
(In meetings, one on one, etc.) (Never, Rarely (1-3 times), Occasionally (4-6 times), Regularly (7 or more times))

2) Is this administrator in your line of supervision?  
(Yes/ No/ Decline to State)

3) With which School are you associated?  
(Letters and Sciences, Engineering, Marine Transportation and Logistics, Library, No School Affiliation, Decline to State)
## Leadership & Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Participates actively and has a visible presence on campus (e.g. attends campus-wide events, participates in meetings with students and faculty, and etc.)

2) Cultivates a climate of mutual respect and shared values.

3) Actively seeks to improve university’s performance.

4) Demonstrates understanding of what faculty need in order to do their jobs successfully.

5) Shows flexibility in helping faculty obtain the resources needed to do their jobs successfully.

6) Establishes effective relationships within and beyond areas of supervision.

Please provide additional comments as necessary to explain your choices.
### Personal and Cultural Awareness and Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Interacts with cultural sensitivity, diplomacy, and respect.
2. Sets reasonable expectations.
3. Models professional attitudes and behaviors.

Please provide additional comments as necessary to explain your choices.
Communication, Collaboration, & Shared Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Communicates information clearly with others.
2) Values faculty input in policy development and decision-making processes.
3) Encourages collaboration among faculty.
4) Values teamwork and collective problem-solving.
5) Responsive to faculty concerns.
6) Explains the administrative decisions effectively

Please provide additional comments as necessary to explain your choices.
## Service & Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Respects and honors faculty and their specific field of expertise
2) Supports and appreciates research across all disciplines.
3) Values and appreciates all types of institutional service that faculty engage in.
4) Keeps up with latest industry trends and regulations and implements them aboard Training Ship Golden Bear (Captain of the Ship).

Please provide additional comments as necessary to explain your choices.
1) After reading their job description, do you think this administrator meets the expectations for their position in the university?

2) Describe aspects of the administrator’s job performance that are exceptional.

3) Describe aspects of the administrator’s job performance that require attention or need improvement.

If you have any additional feedback and comments, please state below.