

SPECIAL REPORT
of the
FACULTY SENATE AD-HOC COMMITTEE
concerning
REVIEW AND RETENTION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Presented at the
514th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate
October 5, 1995

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Joseph S. Larson, Chairman
Maria Tymoczko
Jeremiah M. Allen

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE
ON REVIEW AND RETENTION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Background Documentation

1. With respect to the selection, evaluation and retention process for academic administrators, the initial action taken by the University Trustees was adoption of Trustee Document T70-62A (The Morris Report) that provides for faculty participation in the selection of major administrators on the Amherst campus and for selection, evaluation, resignation or removal of Heads or Chairs of Departments and faculty members, via Personnel Committee actions. Student involvement is included in the process through participation in or contribution to Personnel Committee actions.

2. The Trustees subsequently adopted the Board of Trustees Statement on University Governance (T73-098) amended 4/27/75, 6/1/88, 2/3/93. T73-098 has also served to place the governance role of faculty members and students within the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) nationally recognized policy framework by endorsing, “in principal, the AAUP 1966 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities and the AAUP 1970 Joint Statement on Student Participation in College and University Government¹ insofar as they are consistent with this Trustee’s Statement on University Governance”. Trustee endorsement of this AAUP statement places the University of Massachusetts in a position compatible with national AAUP policies that call for significant involvement of faculty and students in the selection of the President, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts and Deans. T73-098 also provides for student evaluation of faculty teaching and, through that mechanism, involves students in decisions on faculty retention.

3. Trustee Document T84-036, amended June 5, 1991, subsequently established the process and criteria for evaluation of senior administrators: President, Chancellors, Vice Presidents, Vice Chancellors, Provosts, Deans/Directors.

4. Trustee Document T93-080 additionally provides guidelines for the review and evaluation of the President, Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts, Deans/Directors. This document, in conjunction with T84-036, meets, in part, the national standards set forth in the AAUP 1981 *Statement on Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation and Retention of Administrators*, an AAUP statement not otherwise specifically referenced in Trustee documents.

¹This reference to a 1970 *Statement* appears to be a clerical error because the material on students appears as part of the 1966 *Statement*.

Faculty and Student Roles in Summary

Selection and Evaluation

University of Massachusetts Trustee policy currently provides for faculty and student participation in the selection and evaluation of Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts, Deans/Directors, Heads and Chairs, and members of the faculty (via search and Personnel Committee actions). It provides for the evaluation of Vice Presidents, but not for their selection. There is no provision for faculty and student participation in the selection or evaluation of Deputy Chancellors (Table 1). This suggests that Vice Presidents and Deputy Chancellors are staff and not line positions; a redefinition of these positions as line positions would involve amendment of Trustee Policy, in order to insure faculty and student participation in the selection and evaluation of these administrators.

Table 1. Trustee Documents Providing for Faculty and Student Participation in Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators and Faculty Members

<u>Administrator</u>	<u>Selection</u>	<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>Retention</u>
President	T73-098	T84-036, T93-080	---
Vice President	---	T84-036, T93-080	---
Chancellor	T73-098, T70-62A	T84-036, T93-080	---
Dpty Chancellor	---	---	---
Vice Chancellor	T73-098, T70-62A	T84-036, T93-080	---
Provost	T73-098, T70-62A	T84-036, T93-080	---
Dean/Director	T73-098, T70-62A	T84-036, T93-080	---
Head/Chair	T70-62A	T70-62A	T70-62A
Faculty Member	T70-62A	T70-62A, T73-098	T70-62A, T73-098

Retention

Faculty participate directly, and via Personnel Committee actions, in decisions to retain or remove Heads/Chairs and faculty members. Students, via course evaluations and in participation in or contribution to Personnel Committee actions, also participate in decisions to retain Heads/Chairs and faculty members. Outside of the evaluation process, there are no provisions for faculty or student participation in decisions to retain administrators at any level above that of Head/Chair.

University of Massachusetts/Amherst in the National Context

Trustee Policy and practice on the Amherst campus is consistent with national AAUP standards with respect to faculty and student involvement in selection and evaluation of administrators, if Vice Presidents and Deputy Chancellors are regarded as staff positions. With respect to faculty and student participation with regard to retention of administrators above the level of Head/Chair, University of Massachusetts policy is not consistent with national norms as expressed in AAUP's 1981 *Statement on Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation and Retention of Administrators*. This is at variance with an otherwise consistent pattern of Trustee policy.

Nationally, in recent years concern has heightened over governance decisions being taken on many campuses that seriously erode the ability of faculty members to defend and maintain academic freedom and tenure. This has reached a level of sufficient urgency to prompt AAUP to extend its institutional censure process beyond the traditional scope of academic freedom issues to include serious violations of governance standards, including faculty involvement in appointment, evaluation and retention of administrators. Heretofore AAUP censure had applied to colleges and universities only for academic freedom and tenure infractions that impacted individual faculty members. Since extending the censure process, AAUP has cited two institutions for violations of governance standards.

The University of Massachusetts at Amherst is not, in our view, in present danger of review by AAUP for governance infractions, probably because we have a long history of, and Trustee commitment to, policies that deflect and avoid this kind of problem. This is a position that we believe ought to be maintained and strengthened by adoption of amendments to Trustee policies that would provide for faculty and student involvement in retention decisions.

Recommended Action

We view the intent of the Senate motion as charging us to recommend a process that would lead to Trustee adoption of a policy that would provide for faculty and student participation in decisions regarding retention of administrators. We have approached our task by drafting a Senate motion that would request the Trustees to adopt amendments (below) to existing Trustee policies. We view these amendments as logical extensions of current Trustee policy.

We therefore recommend that the Trustees of the University of Massachusetts adopt the following amendments to Trustee policies:

A. RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT TO TRUSTEE POLICY T73-098

I.A.4. ENDORSEMENT OF AAUP STATEMENTS ON GOVERNANCE

The Board of Trustees therefore endorses in principle the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities adopted by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council of Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges ~~and including the 1970 statement on section on Student Status. Participation in College and University Government~~ formulated by the three aforementioned organizations, and the American Association of University Professors 1981 Statement on Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation and Retention of Administrators, insofar as both are consistent with this Trustee's Statement on University Governance. In endorsing these two statements, the Board, while retaining its ultimate legal authority in governing the University, recognizes that the faculty, the students, and other groups within the University have the right, the responsibility and the privilege of advising on policies affecting the University. The Board will ensure these rights, responsibilities, and privileges through the various governing bodies—both representative bodies such as senates and assemblies, and administrative bodies such as departments, school, and colleges—established by its bylaws and other actions.

II.D.2. CAMPUS GOVERNING BODIES

2. When appropriate, governing bodies shall have the privilege of recommending policies and procedures affecting the campus and the University as a whole, including, among other matters, academic matters, matters of faculty status, and student affairs. Also when appropriate, governing bodies will have the privilege of contributing to long-range planning, the preparation of the annual budget request, ~~and the allocation of available resources, and the selection, evaluation and retention of administrators, as described elsewhere in Trustee Policy Documents.~~

B. RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT TO TRUSTEE POLICY T84-036

V. Retention of Senior Administrators

The results of evaluations of senior administrators will normally be taken into consideration when it is necessary to make decisions pertaining to retention of senior administrators. It is recognized that there will be circumstances when the Trustees or the appropriate administrator may find it necessary, between scheduled evaluations and at any time, to consider retention or non-retention of a President, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Provost, Dean or Director. With respect to decisions on retention and non-retention the appropriate Trustee body or administrator shall seek appraisals of the same governance bodies and administrators as are consulted in the evaluation process appropriate for the administrative position in question.

C. RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT TO TRUSTEE POLICY T93-080

VI. Retention of Senior Administrator

(Same language as recommended for T84-036.)

The results of evaluations of senior administrators will normally be taken into consideration when it is necessary to make decisions pertaining to retention of senior administrators. It is recognized that there will be circumstances when the Trustees or the appropriate administrator may find it necessary, between scheduled evaluations and at any time, to consider retention or non-retention of a President, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Provost, Dean or Director. With respect to decisions on retention and non-retention the appropriate Trustee body or administrator shall seek appraisals of the same governance bodies and administrators as are consulted in the evaluation process appropriate for the administrative position in question.

D. FURTHER ACTION

We further recommend that, following Faculty Senate endorsement of the recommended Trustee policy amendments, the Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees share the Senate's action with his counterparts from the Boston, Dartmouth, Lowell, and Worcester campuses through the vehicle of the Intercampus Council to inform them of the Senate's action and to request that they bring these issues before their respective governance bodies.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate request the Chancellor to transmit to the Trustees of the University of Massachusetts for their consideration and adoption the Faculty Senate's proposed amendments to Trustee Documents T73-098 (as amended), T84-036 (as amended), and T93-080 as presented in Senate Document 96-006A; and that the Faculty Delegate to the Trustees from the Amherst Campus convey these actions to Faculty representatives from the other campuses of the University of Massachusetts as specified in Senate Document 96-006A.