

To: Scott Jones, Secretary, Faculty Senate

CC: Marilyn Kintzele, President, Faculty Senate

From: Mohammad Meybodi, Chair
Faculty Senate Administrative Review Committee

Subject: 2005-2006 Annual Report

Date: May 10, 2006

Background and Composition of the Committee

The Faculty Senate Administrative Review Committee for 2005-2006 was composed of the following members: Margo Sorgman, Marcia Gillette, Debra Fawcett, Kathy Holcomb, Allen Safianow, and Mohammad Meybodi.

Allen Safianow and Margo Sorgman served as the co-chair of the Committee until December 2005; Mohammad Meybodi served as the chair of committee in 2006. Due to sabbatical leave of Allen Safianow in Spring 2006, he was replaced by Kathy Holcomb.

Work Completed

The Faculty Senate Administrative Review Committee (FSARC) in 2005-2006 had activities in the following two areas:

- 1) The primary task of the FSARC was development of a set of guidelines and procedures for the Administrative Review of Vice Chancellors. This task was really continuation of the activities started in 2004-2005 by the Committee. Through hard work and dedication of Committee members, the FSARC developed a set of effective guidelines and procedures along with the timeline for the Administrative Review of Vice Chancellors. Based on the guidelines, the Committee also developed two survey instruments for the review of Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Enrollment and Vice Chancellor for Information Technology. The set of guidelines, timeline, and the two survey instruments passed Faculty Senate in Spring 2006.
- 2) The other task of the FSARC was initiation and monitoring the review progress for three administrators: Dr. Robert Roales, Chair of NIMS; Dr. Richard Aniskiewicz, Chair of Social and Behavioral Sciences; and Dr. Susan Sciame-Giesecke, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences

Following the guidelines, each unit elected their committee, distributed evaluation instruments, collected the instruments, summarized evaluations, and reported the final result to immediate supervisor of the administrator under review. Each committee also sent a procedural report to the chair of FSARC. All three reviews have been completed by late Spring semester. From procedural reports, although there were delayed and changes for one review, overall the review process for each review progressed smoothly.

The reports also suggest the following recommendations: 1) The sample size for some review process was relatively small; implying special care needs to be taken to interpret the results. 2) Clarification of the number of external reviewers and perhaps separate analysis of external and internal data. 3) Revision of the survey instrument to better represent the administrator under review.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to all members of FSARC especially former co-chairs of the Committee Margo Sorgman and Allen Safianow for their dedication and hard work in developing the guidelines. Thanks and appreciations are also due to Departmental/School representatives Marcia Gillette, Kathryn Holcomb, and Robin Symonds for their cooperation and coordination of the review process.