

TRIENNIAL REVIEWS

Eastern seeks to assure that all the members of its community have accurate information as to performance expectations and perceptions of that performance. Members of the Administrative Support Faculty have annual processes for the development and communication of information about goals, accomplishments, and assessments. The State Board and the Chancellor have policies for the annual and five-year review of presidents. Because of the leadership nature of certain administrative positions, Eastern complements annual review procedures with triennial reviews which incorporate input from faculty and other members of the university community reporting to the administrator under review. The policy that follows applies to all Directors in academic affairs, Deans, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, and the Provost. It serves to ensure that faculty and other members of the university community are involved in the triennial review process to a degree at least co-extensive with their role in the original selection process.

Eastern's policy is as follows:

I. All colleagues to whom this policy applies participate in annual evaluations, as described in the Faculty/Staff Handbook. These annual evaluations provide an important means by which the employee and her or his supervisor share information about appropriate goals for the coming year and about the degree of achievement of goals for the preceding year.

II. Prior to the completion of the third year and every three years thereafter, the performance of the academic or administrative leader will be evaluated through a participatory process. This process shall include the distribution of a questionnaire to all units reporting to the administrator under evaluation, as well as to a selected list of external constituents as appropriate for the purpose of soliciting feedback about the performance of the administrator. Under Oregon law, personnel reviews may not, with the exception of course reaction surveys, make use of anonymous information unless a waiver has been obtained. The person being reviewed will be offered the opportunity to waive access to the identity of those who provide evaluative information. Any decision not to waive this access will not, in any way, adversely affect the tone, conclusions, or outcomes of the review. Waivers of access will be in writing. The questionnaire itself will indicate whether or not access to the identity of evaluators has been waived.

The attached time schedule and questionnaire for triennial reviews are recommended, although the supervisor of the administrator under review may determine an alternate schedule and questionnaire if appropriate.

III. A confidential summary of the questionnaire responses will be created by the supervisor (or a designated confidential aide agreed on by the reviewee). Prior to preparation of the final draft of the summary, the reviewee will be given the opportunity to review a draft and to write an accompanying response. Both documents, together with

a final written evaluation shall both become part of the reviewee's personnel file. The written evaluation may include performance-related commendations and recommendations. The reviewee must read, sign, and receive a copy of the evaluation before any further action.

Included will be a recommendation from the supervisor to the President (if the immediate supervisor is not the President) on the continuation of the appointment. The triennial process would not, alone, lead to abrogation of commitments contained in a notice of appointment, including the tenure-related nature of the appointment.

Once the process is complete, the questionnaires upon which the summary is based will be destroyed. There will be absolutely no wider or "public" sharing of the evaluative information by the University. These processes are carried out in compliance with all established OAR's and university rules and regulations.

IV: Human Resources shall keep a record of the year of the most recent triennial review of each administrator. If an administrator is due for a triennial review in a given year, Human Resources shall alert the both the administrator due for review and the immediate supervisor by the third week of fall term.

SUGGESTED TIMELINE AND QUESTIONNAIRE

By January 1: Executive Committee triggers appropriate reviews by notifying President and pertinent administrator.

By Friday of week 2 of winter term: Reviewee submits to immediate supervisor a very brief portfolio summarizing accomplishments of prior three years in accordance with the position description and the university mission. Reviewee includes a list of all units reporting to that position as well as a selected list of external constituents as appropriate.

By Friday of week 3 of winter term: Questionnaire is distributed (by Institutional Research) electronically to all those included on the submitted list.

Under Oregon law, personnel reviews may not, with the exception of course reaction surveys, make use of anonymous information unless a waiver has been obtained. The person being reviewed may waive access to the identity of those who provide evaluative information. A decision not to waive access will not adversely affect the tone, conclusions, or outcomes of the review. Waivers of access will be in writing. The questionnaire itself will indicate whether or not access to the identity of evaluators has been waived. The questionnaire appears at the end of this outline of steps.

By Friday of week 5 of winter term: The supervisor (or a designated confidential aide agreed on by the reviewee) will prepare a confidential summary of the responses to the questionnaire and present it to the supervisor.

By Friday of week 7 of winter term: A summary written by the supervisor or aide will be shared in conference with the person being reviewed. The reviewee may write an accompanying response. Both documents become part of the personnel file.

The supervisor may seek more detailed evaluation through letters. All processes above would be repeated in this case according to an equivalent time line.

By Friday of week 8 of winter term: After the conference, a written evaluation of the reviewee should include both assessment of performance against the position description based on concrete evidence and ample analysis and consideration of the nature and quality of questionnaire responses. The reviewee must read, sign, and receive a copy of the evaluation before any further action.

**Campus Administrative Leader Evaluation
2005**

Eastern Oregon University

Evaluation is an essential element in maintaining and improving leadership on campus. Your assistance and careful thought in completing this evaluation is appreciated and will be held in confidence. Please select the response most closely associated with your personal evaluation of the leader for the Academic Years 2002/03 – 2004/05.

Leader's Name: _____

	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree					No Opportunity to Observe	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Planning/Vision												
• Supports the mission of the university	1	2	3	4	5							
• Promotes diversity	1	2	3	4	5							
• Fosters a shared vision among faculty and staff	1	2	3	4	5							
• Establishes realistic goals for the unit/department	1	2	3	4	5							
Communication												
• Honors different points of view within the boundaries of the values and mission of the university	1	2	3	4	5							
• Is reasonably accessible	1	2	3	4	5							
• Is an effective spokesperson for the faculty and staff	1	2	3	4	5							
• Provides information to faculty and staff, explains and supports university policies	1	2	3	4	5							
• Is a good listener, sensitive and perceptive when working with people	1	2	3	4	5							
Decision Making and Management												
• Makes decisions linked to the vision, mission, and strategic priorities of the university	1	2	3	4	5							
• Administers budget effectively	1	2	3	4	5							

• Works well with other administrators	1	2	3	4	5		
• Manages office routines and staff effectively	1	2	3	4	5		
• Solves problems effectively	1	2	3	4	5		
Instructional Leadership (applies only to Deans)							
• Helps faculty improve their teaching	1	2	3	4	5		
• Works to improve teaching and scholarly environments	1	2	3	4	5		
• Works to recruit and retain high quality faculty	1	2	3	4	5		
• Fosters faculty development	1	2	3	4	5		
• Recognizes faculty and staff accomplishments	1	2	3	4	5		
• Develops / upholds standards of quality for faculty and students	1	2	3	4	5		
• Conducts fair review and personnel procedures	1	2	3	4	5		
What are particular strengths of this administrator?							
What specific aspects do you think need improvement?							

