



# ACADEMIC SENATE

## CSU BAKERSFIELD

### Evaluation of Academic Administrators - Part II

#### RES 242525

FAC

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate requests the President, in collaboration with the Division of People and Culture, explores mechanisms for obtaining feedback from faculty regarding the performance of administrators on campus, including those outside of the Division of Academic Affairs.

**RESOLVED:** The President, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, will determine review processes for new administrative positions within the Division of Academic Affairs, or when there is a change to existing administrative positions (e.g., revised roles, titles, etc.).

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate recommend revisions to the University Handbook language regarding the evaluation of academic and university-wide administrators. (Deletions in ~~strike~~through, additions in **bold underline**.)

**RATIONALE:** This resolution clarifies the membership of review committees for Associate Deans, including College Associate Deans and the Associate Dean of EEGO. Recent changes to campus, including the elimination and/or capturing of some administrative positions, also requires flexibility and adaptability of review procedures.

### 311.1 General Guidelines

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three-year intervals. The President will initiate the review process for the Provost in writing, and the Provost's office, in writing, will initiate the review process for all academic administrators. In August of each academic year, the Provost's office will send to the Executive Committee of the Senate a schedule of which administrators will undergo review in the current academic year and the next academic year. The President or Provost may, if they believe it is appropriate, call for an evaluation of an individual before a scheduled evaluation. Academic administrators who are retiring or who have left the administrative role shall be reviewed upon exiting the respective role; this review shall also apply to academic administrators who are promoted or temporarily move into interim roles.

#### Academic Senate

California State University, Bakersfield  
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • 22 EDUC • Bakersfield, CA 93311

## **311.2 Academic Administrators**

The following positions shall be subject to this policy:

- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA)
- AVP Academic Affairs/Dean of Academic Programs
- AVP Enrollment Management
- AVP Faculty Affairs
- AVP Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP)
- AVP Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA)
- Dean, College of Arts and Humanities
- Dean, College of Business and Public Administration
- Dean, College of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering
- Dean, College of Social Sciences and Education
- Dean, University Library
- Dean, Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)
- **Associate Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)**
- Dean, California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus
- ~~And all respective College~~ All Associate Deans
- **And other administrator positions as determined by the President, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate**

The Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) is formed in the Spring of the administrator's second year, and the review process begins in the Fall of the third year. The supervisor for each administrator undergoing review is responsible for providing the criteria for evaluation to the administrator and to the AARC.

## **311.3 Review Committee Membership**

For review of the P&VPAA, AVP Academic Affairs/Dean of Academic Programs, AVP Enrollment Management, AVP Faculty Affairs, AVP GRaSP, AVP IRPA, ~~and~~ Dean of EEGO, **Associate Dean of EEGO, and academic administrators not mentioned elsewhere who are subject to this policy**, the review committee shall be as follows:

A. The faculty of each college shall elect one tenured faculty;

**B. The General Faculty (including teaching faculty, librarians, and counselors) shall elect one at-large tenured faculty:**

~~BC. The Provost (or President, in the case of the review of the P&VPAA)~~ The President or Provost shall select a member of the Provost's Council; and

~~CD. The Provost (or President, in the case of the review of the P&VPAA)~~ The President or Provost shall choose a sixth member of the committee.

For review of the Dean of Arts and Humanities, Dean of Business and Public Administration, Dean of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering, Dean of Social Sciences and Education, Dean of University Library, Dean of the CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus, and College or Library Associate Deans, the review committee shall consist of five members.

A. The faculty of the college dean being reviewed, or the librarians in the case of the Dean of University Library, shall elect three (3) tenured faculty members or librarians. In the case of the Antelope Valley Campus Dean, an election shall be held to select three (3) representatives from the faculty, staff, and librarians who are at the Antelope Valley Campus.

B. The P&VPAA shall select a college dean for the review of Deans, or an associate dean for the review of College or Library Associate Deans; and

C. The P&VPAA shall choose the fifth member of the committee.

Any prospective committee member with an active grievance (or other legal proceeding) against the specific Administrator under review at the time of review is not eligible for election or selection and cannot serve on the review committee.

The administrator under review may request that the supervisor of the review recuse any member who is ineligible due to an active grievance (or other legal proceeding) against the administrator under review, and the Senate will initiate a new election to replace that individual.

#### **311.4 Review Procedures and Constituencies**

The procedures for review committees of academic officers are as follows:

A. The President and P&VPAA shall maintain a schedule showing the year in which the regular review of each administrative officer is due, and shall complete the committee selection and initiate the review process prior to the end of the academic year preceding the actual academic year in which the review takes place. A schedule for an evaluation should then be constructed with April 1 as the target date for completion of the process. A list of academic officers to be reviewed with review timelines shall be made available on the Provost's website. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is charged with maintaining and updating this list.

B. At the time of initial appointment and immediately following each review, the supervisor will review with the administrator being evaluated the areas (i.e., academic leadership, program development, management, diversity initiatives, etc.) in which their performance will be assessed. In all cases, the areas to be evaluated will include aspects of the position outlined in the job description and the following, as relevant:

1. Leadership and Strategic Vision (e.g., ability to set clear goals, make informed decisions, and inspire faculty, staff, and students toward achieving institutional objectives)
2. Resource and Financial Management (e.g., effective oversight of budgets, personnel, and operational resources, ensuring sustainability and efficiency in daily operations)
3. Academic Program Development and Quality Assurance (e.g., support for curriculum innovation, academic standards, and research initiatives while ensuring compliance with accreditation and quality benchmarks)
4. Student Success and Support Services (e.g., implementation of policies that enhance student retention, graduation rates, and equitable access to academic and support services)
5. Faculty and Staff Development and Support (e.g., promoting professional development, fostering an environment of excellence, and ensuring that faculty and staff are well-supported in fulfilling their roles and achieving success)
6. External Relations and Fundraising (e.g., building partnerships with external stakeholders, enhancing the institution's reputation, and securing external funding for institutional growth)
7. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (e.g., contributing to the creation of an inclusive campus environment that values diversity, promotes equity, and ensures all members of the community feel respected and supported)

In setting up the review process, the supervisor will solicit advice from the administrator under review as to any additional areas that should be included in the evaluation. In all cases, the appropriate faculty, librarians and staff shall be given the opportunity to participate in the evaluation.

The supervisor will complete the process of academic administrator review committee formation by October 1<sup>st</sup> of the academic year in which the review takes place. The supervisor will provide the review committee information regarding the additional areas where the administrator's performance is to be assessed. The academic administrator review committee shall elect its own chair.

In the case of University-level administrators, including the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Associate Vice Presidents, Dean of the University Library, Dean of the Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach, and Dean of the California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus, the constituents shall include faculty, staff, and students from the entire University community. Constituents participating in the review process shall be connected to the work of the administrator who is actively under review as determined by the review committee. These constituents shall be given an opportunity to participate in the evaluation. The administrator's supervisor may recommend additional constituencies to be sampled.

In the case of College-level administrators, including the College Deans, School Deans, and Associate Deans, constituents shall include faculty, staff, and students from the respective College, or School (if applicable). Constituents participating in the review process shall be connected to the work of the administrator who is actively under review as determined by the review committee. These constituents shall be given an opportunity to participate in the evaluation. The administrator's supervisor may recommend additional constituencies to be sampled.

The areas of assessment should not be changed once the supervisor has reviewed them with the administrator being evaluated unless the administrator and supervisor agree and provide written justification for the changes in assessment to the academic administrator review committee. Throughout the review process, all parties shall bear in mind that the purpose of the administrator review is developmental as well as evaluative, in keeping with the essential mission of the University.

C. The review committee shall request from the administrator under review a ~~concise~~-thorough and detailed self-study. The self-study will focus on areas to be evaluated, major accomplishments, problems and issues related to the responsibilities of the position (e.g. job description), future goals and plans, and personal professional development and accomplishments. The self-study shall include evidence and documentation to support evidence of major accomplishments, and evidence of the administrator's roles, contributions, and support of faculty and staff under their supervision. The review committee shall review evidence of accomplishments provided by the administrator. The administrator under review should provide evidence of their own contributions. Administrators with oversight of faculty and staff projects or activities should acknowledge the contributions of other administrators, faculty or staff responsible for the project/activities. A clear distinction should be identified between administrator accomplishments and those of the faculty/staff under their supervision. This self-study shall be completed and submitted to the review committee and the supervisor.

D. The review committee shall survey various performance appraisal systems to determine the appropriate guidelines and instruments for the evaluation process. The evaluation shall cover a three-year period; therefore, the guidelines and process should be constructed to reflect this time frame. The committee, in consultation with the supervisor and the person being reviewed, shall develop the specific format for the appraisal.

E. In the case of evaluation of College Associate Deans, during the third year, all College Deans, including those in their final year of service as College Associate Dean and those who are retiring, shall be reviewed by the College faculty. The Dean shall meet with the faculty to discuss how they wish to proceed with the review. In preparation for the review, College Associate Deans, may, at their own initiative, submit to the College faculty and the Dean a brief self-evaluation of their performance for the period under review. In addition, the appropriate Dean shall offer the opportunity to all faculty of the College to give individual, confidential advice, orally, or in writing. This review shall assess the College Associate Dean's effectiveness based on the criteria established at the time of appointment. The review must occur during the fall semester of the third year. The written review of the College Associate Dean should be submitted to the

College Dean by April first (1st) of that year. The Dean and the ~~School~~ College Associate Dean shall then meet to discuss the report by April 15th.

F. The review committee shall issue calls for feedback and comments at multiple times in the review process and shall remind constituents that the process is confidential. Individuals participating in the evaluation of administrators shall submit their written comments ~~on~~ in a confidential survey that does not collect identifiable information (e.g., names, email addresses). This survey shall include quantitative and qualitative (i.e., open-ended) assessments, including questions about constituency type so that data can be disaggregated and reviewed by the committee. The review committee may work with Information Technology Services to develop the survey and build processes for ensuring confidentiality, fairness, and validity. The comments will then be coded, deidentified, and aggregated by the review committee to ensure the person's confidentiality in the review process. Examination of the deidentified and aggregated documents by the administrator under review may occur in the event of a protested personnel action. Comments will be collected, and the confidential coding maintained in the office of the ~~P&VPAA~~ administrator's supervisor.

G. While conducting their review, the review committee may request a meeting with the administrator under review to request additional evidence, context, and documentation related to the self-study and the areas under review to be used in finalizing their final report. The review committee shall consolidate all evaluations and forward the final report, which will include the administrator's self-study, to the appropriate supervisor. The administrator's supervisor will review the evaluation, self-study, and any written response, discuss these with the administrator under review, and forward the package with appropriate comments/recommendations to the President with a copy to the administrator under review by April 15<sup>th</sup> of that year. In cases where there is a supervisory level between the administrator under review and the P&VPAA, the evaluation shall pass through that level for comments and go forward to the P&VPAA. The supervisor's written comments and recommendations should include components related to future goals and plans in addition to the expected review and comments on the evaluation.

In the case of the P&VPAA, the same process as outlined above will be followed except that the review committee's report shall be forwarded directly to the President.

H. In all cases the final review level will be the President.

I. In the case of the review of the P&VPAA, the President and P&VPAA shall meet to discuss the report before acknowledging to the campus that the review process has been completed by May 1<sup>st</sup> of that year. In the case of the review of the AVPs and Deans, the P&VPAA and administrator under review shall meet to discuss the report before acknowledging to the campus that the review process has been completed by May 1<sup>st</sup> of that year.

J. In the event the administrator under review does not agree with any aspect of the evaluation, a written commentary may be submitted, and it shall accompany the report. The administrator under review shall have ten working days after receiving a copy of the final evaluation to prepare ~~his/her~~ their reaction and commentary. The Academic Administrator Review Committee and all respondents are protected from any

form of reprisal, not only by the expectation of high ethical behavior from all University personnel, but by Executive Order No. 929 and California Government Code Section 8547.12.

HK. Provisions governing campus personnel files such as confidentiality, disclosure, and rebuttal shall apply to the evaluation process. The consolidated report and all data collected for this report will become a part of the personnel file and will reside in the office of the administrator's supervisor.

**Distribution List:**

President

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPA)

AVP Academic Affairs/Dean of Academic Programs

AVP Enrollment Management

AVP Faculty Affairs

AVP Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP)

AVP Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA)

Dean, College of Arts and Humanities

Dean, College of Business and Public Administration

Dean, College of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering

Dean, College of Social Sciences and Education

Dean, University Library

Dean, Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)

Associate Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)

Dean, California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus

Associate Deans

Department Chairs

General Faculty

---

Approved by the Academic Senate: April 10, 2025

Sent to the President: April 25, 2025

President Approved: June 5, 2025