



4-7-1994

**April 7, 1994**

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

---

**Recommended Citation**

University of North Dakota. "April 7, 1994" (1994). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 422.  
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/422>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the UND Publications at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

## Minutes of the University Senate Meeting

April 7, 1994

1.

The April meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:10 p.m. on Thursday, April 7, 1994, in room 7, Gamble Hall. John A. Williams presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Alkezweeny, Abdul J.	Hill, Richard L.	O'Kelly, Bernard
Anderegg, Jeanne	Hoffarth, Al	O'Kelly, Marcia
Antes, James R.	Irwin, Nathan	Omdahl, Lloyd
Baker, Kendall L.	Johnson, A. William	Phillips, Monte L.
Beiswenger, Lyle	Johnson, Phil	Poehls, Alice
Bender, Myron	Knudson, Kari	Rankin, Elizabeth
Bostrom, A. Joy	Kweit, Mary	Richards, Thomas
Davis, W. Jeremy	Kweit, Robert W.	Schneider, Mary Jane
Elsinga, Lillian	Lawrence, W. Fred	Schubert, George W.
Fivizzani, Albert J.	Lee, Randy H.	Sheridan, Daniel
Gabrynowicz, Joanne	Lemon, Donald	Slotnick, Henry B.
Gard, Betty	Lindholm, Lynn M.	Szigeti, Elivra
Grabe, Mark D.	Ludtke, Richard	Uhlenberg, Beverly
Hampsten, Elizabeth	Mason, Mark	Williams, John A.
Harris, Mary	McElroy-Edwards, J.	Wilsnack, Sharon C.
Heitkamp, Thomasine	Naismith, Donald P.	Winrich, Lonny
Henry, Gordon H.	Navara, James L.	

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Adams, Shaun	Iserman, Scott	Owens, Thomas C.
Boyd, Robert	Jacobsen, Bruce	Retzlaff, Cory
D'Andraia, Frank	Jensen, Clayton	Schmitt, Sue
DeRemer, E. Dale	Knoll, Harvey P.	Strathe, Marlene
Gerhardt, Cassie	Koozin, Timothy	Swisher, Wayne
Gershman, Kathleen	Lepire, Chris	Tobac, David
Gust, Ian	Lewis, Robert W.	Twohey, Denise
Hamerlik, Gerald	Lockney, Thomas	Volden, Cecilia
Hein, David W.	Loney, Jason	Wagner, Heather
Henly, George	Merrill, Lois J.	
Henriksen, Mogens	Norberg, Jon	
Hess, Carla Wulff	Odegard, John	

The Chair made the following announcements: 1) The Senate Executive Committee considered the following request from Vice President Strathe:

With the organization of an office of Enrollment Management, which includes admissions, the position of Director of Admissions and Records now is titled Director of Records and encompasses the responsibilities of the registrar. All references to the Director of Admissions and Records in the Constitution and Senate Committee Manual should be changed to Director of Records. One exception is with regard to membership on the University Admissions Committee which should state, "administrator responsible for admission."

The Director of Records should retain a position of membership on the following committees: Administrative Procedures Committee, University Curriculum Committee, Senate Executive Committee and the Student Academic Standards Committee.

The Executive Committee acting as a codification committee agreed to make the editorial changes and announce them at the April Senate meeting. Mr. Winrich moved that the Senate give the Executive Committee power to act as the Codification Committee to make these changes. Mr. Baker seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Mr. Baker moved a substitute motion to place this item at the beginning of the Business Calendar. Mr. Winrich seconded this motion. A vote was taken and the motion carried with 47 members voting for and 1 other. 2) The Executive Committee decided that the total number of faculty serving on the Senate will remain the same (46) for the 1994-95 academic year but that the issue should be looked at by the 1994-95 Executive Committee since the number of ex-officio members will decrease.

Ms. Lindholm announced that the Senate Executive Committee will sponsor a forum on the Role of the Senate in Restructuring and Reorganization to be held Monday, April 25, from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. and that President Baker, Dean O'Kelly, and Randy Lee have agreed to participate.

Mr. Lee announced that he had attended a meeting today over IVN of the NDUS Council of College Faculties. The Board is in the process of hiring a Chancellor and a part of every semi finalist interview will be held over IVN on May 4, 5, and 6. Each campus should set up a schedule and identify people to watch the set presentation over IVN. People are immediately needed to handout, collect and summarize the comments. This will be the only campus opportunity to view the finalists.

Mr. Lee also announced that the State Compensation Committee was disbanded by the Chancellor and the duties were given to the Council of College Faculties which created a subcommittee for this task. A subcommittee report recommending faculty salaries was not tiered by types of schools. The report recommended a 7% per year increase for each biennium with 3% of this amount as a cost of living increase. The President's Cabinet recommended tiering and not locking in the 3%, but the Council declined to do that and approved the report, as submitted, to go to the Board of Higher Education.

Mr. Baker reported that he will get the schedule arranged for hearing Chancellor interviews. His understanding is that there will be a chance for interactive questioning at that time. Dave Vorland and Jim Penwarden will work on publicity and the Senate Executive Committee will arrange for people to collect data. Mr. Baker said that the Cabinet's report to the Board of Higher Education will recommend tiering and the 7% faculty salaries increase without specification.

Mr. Baker announced the names of the following faculty who will serve on the Planning Council: Thomas Owens (E&M), David Hein (Med), Cecilia Volden (Nsg), Jeffrey Stith (CAS), Albert Fivizzani (A&S), Elizabeth Hampsten (A&S), Randy Lee (Law), and Sara Hanhan (CTL).

4.

The Chair read the following correction to the Senate minutes of March 3, 1994: Item 3 should begin, "Mr. O'Kelly announced that the following resolution had been passed on February 17, 1994," and continue with the remainder of that item as recorded in the minutes. The Chair asked for further additions or corrections and since there were none, declared the minutes approved with the above correction.

5.

The Question Period was held and Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Baker about the reaction of the State Board to the UND General Education Transfer Resolution. Mr. Baker said that the Board realized that an important component of the implementation of this resolution would be a committee to facilitate the process.

Ms. Lindholm asked for an update regarding the VP of Health Sciences. Mr. Baker replied that the position of VP for Health Sciences already exists. Currently a search is underway to fill the position of Dean of the School of Medicine.

6.

The Chair called for the annual report of the Continuing Education Committee. Mr. Slotnik moved to receive the report and Mr. Bender seconded the motion which was voted upon and carried.

7.

Mr. Schubert moved that the Business agenda be reordered to move item 11, the resolution on Intercollegiate Athletics, to the first item on the Business Calendar. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried by a vote of 47 for and 3 against.

Mr. Wacker, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee, presented the annual report. Mr. O'Kelly moved to receive the report and Mr. Schubert seconded the motion. Discussion followed and the motion to receive was voted upon and carried.

Ms. Lindholm moved the following revised resolution on Intercollegiate Athletics:

Be it resolved that the University Senate requests a special report from the UND Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. The report would take as its background/starting point the special financial imperatives of restructuring at UND and the national debate on controlling financial and costs of intercollegiate athletics as exemplified in the **Academe** and **NACUBO** report, "The Financial Management of Intercollegiate Athletics Programs."

The report would summarize the financial costs and benefits of UND intercollegiate athletics in way that would educate Senators, students and other interested parties, especially concerning how much funding comes from appropriated funds, how much from alumni funds, other local funds, how much can be transferred to other sources or would just be surrendered, etc. The report would also attempt to summarize, in a form to promote enlightened discussion, the intangible costs and benefits of the present intercollegiate athletics program and to summarize possible alternatives to the present programs which might fulfill the same function.

In this effort, the committee is encouraged to expand its membership by three to include a) the UND representative for Athletics (Dean Schubert's successor); b) a representative from the Alumni Association, and c) a representative of the athletics division, and should encourage input from all interested members of the academic and alumni community as well as from regional citizens.

Ms. Gabrynowicz seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Mr. Mason asked for a friendly amendment to withdraw the part on increasing the membership. Ms. Lindholm agreed to this amendment. The motion was voted upon and carried by a vote of 35 for and 15 against.

8.

Mr. Kweit moved to change the references to "Director of Admissions and Records" currently in the University Constitution to the "Director of Records". Ms. Elsinga seconded the motion which was voted upon and carried by a vote of 48 for and 1 abstaining. (This was the first vote for a change in the Constitution which will be voted upon again at the next Senate meeting.)

9.

Ms. McElroy presented the report from the Committee on Committees on the slate of candidates for election to Senate Committees. The Chair called for nominations from the floor. Mr. Antes nominated Tom Robinson to serve on the Compensation Committee. Ms. Anderegg nominated Jane Berne to serve on the Honors Committee. These names were added to the slate and the Senate proceeded to mark the ballots. A question was asked regarding whether the retirees serving on the committees would be replaced by those nominees receiving the next highest number of votes. Ms. McElroy said that this would be the case. The votes will be counted and will be presented in a report at the next Senate meeting.

10.

The Chair announced that the item on the Revisions in the Code of Student Life was withdrawn by the co-chairs and will appear on next month's agenda.

11.

Mr. Winrich presented the report from the ad hoc committee on Administrator Evaluation and moved to receive the report. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried by a vote of 44 for and 2 against.

Mr. Winrich moved the following:

The University of North Dakota Senate establishes the Standing Committee on Administrator Evaluation. The Standing Committee on Administrator Evaluation shall consist of three members and will be responsible for implementing the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee on Administrator Evaluation.

Initially, committee members will be appointed to one, two and three year terms by the Senate Executive Committee. After 1994, one new member per year shall be determined by the Senate after nomination by the Committee on Committees.

Ms. Bostrom seconded the motion and discussion followed.

Ms. Hampsten moved to divide the question to 1) establish a Standing Committee on Administrator Evaluation and 2) implement the charge as recommended in the report. The motion to divide was voted upon and carried by a vote of 30 for, 12 against and 4 abstaining.

Mr. O'Kelly moved to vote immediately. Mr. Phillips seconded the motion which was voted upon and carried by a vote of 41 for and 5 against.

The motion to establish the Standing Committee on Administrator Evaluation was voted upon and carried by a vote of 26 for, 16 against and 2 abstaining.

Mr. Winrich moved that the recommendations contained in the report be adopted as the charge of the committee. Mr. Mason seconded the motion.

Ms. Gabrynowicz moved to suspend the 5:30 p.m. adjournment rule to continue the meeting until completion of this item. The motion was seconded, voted upon and lost by a vote of 11 for, 19 against, and 2 abstaining.

The meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Alice Poehls  
Secretary

Attachment 1

OUTREACH PROGRAMS  
DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION  
P.O. BOX 9021  
GRAND FORKS, NORTH DAKOTA 58202-9021  
1-800-342-8230  
FAX: 701-777-4282

ADMINISTRATION (701) 777-2661  
ACADEMIC PROGRAMS (701) 777-4235  
PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS (701) 777-2663  
SYSTEM-WIDE DISTANCE EDUCATION (701) 777-2661  
UND GRADUATE CENTER AT BISMARCK (701) 224-5437

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the University Senate

FROM: Dr. Henry Slotnick, Chair *H.S.*  
Continuing Education Committee

DATE: March 24, 1994

RE: Annual Report

During 1993, the Continuing Education Committee dealt with a large number of issues, the most important of which follow immediately.

1. **Constituency Survey.** The Division of Continuing Education conducted a survey of those it has served to better understand both their satisfactions and their needs. The activity involved not only a stratified random sample of those who the Division has served, but also people from each unit within the Division. Results of the survey were used in planning within the Division and are being shared with continuing education offices elsewhere.
2. **Dean's Evaluation.** Dean Robert Boyd was evaluated by a process led by Professor Carla Hess. The qualitative evaluation Professor Hess completed showed the considerable strengths Dean Boyd brings to his position.
3. **Distance Learning.** The development of interactive video technology has helped address the problem of delivery of high quality educational offerings in a cost effective fashion in North Dakota. The Division has been given the task of administering the Interactive Video Network for the state, and it has moved aggressively to develop and deliver a range of courses and programs throughout the state.
4. **College for Kids and CommUniversity.** The Division is no longer coordinating these two activities. In both cases, the reason is financial since both have a history of being well received by the persons they serve.

# UND MEMORANDUM

## DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND BUSINESS LAW

TO: University Senate

DATE: March 23, 1994

FROM: DuWayne Wacker, Chair

RE: ANNUAL REPORT--INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE, 1993-1994

### Committee Members

1992-93

1993-94

Michael Meyer (Sociology)  
 DuWayne Wacker (Accounting)  
 John Wheeldon (Elec. Engineering)  
 Audrey Glick (Comm. Disorders)  
 James Antes (Psychology)  
 Kevin Fire (Comm. Disorders)  
 George Schubert (Institutional  
 Representative)  
 Gordon Caldis (Alumni Member)  
 Mark Foss (Alumni Member)  
 \*Terry Wanless (Athletic Director)  
 Sheri Senne (Student Member)  
 Doug Norberg (Student Member)  
 Troy Winter (Student Member)

John Wheeldon (Elec. Engineering)  
 Audrey Glick (Comm. Disorders)  
 James Antes (Psychology)  
 Kevin Fire (Comm. Disorders)  
 Glenn Olsen (CTL)  
 DuWayne Wacker (Accounting)  
 George Schubert (Institutional  
 Representative)  
 Gordon Caldis (Alumni Member)  
 Mark Foss (Alumni Member)  
 \*Terry Wanless (Athletic Director)  
 Rich Isaac (Student Member)  
 Jerry Hunter (Student Member)  
 Karl Hammerstrom (Student Member)

\*Nonvoting

Others attending meetings on a regular basis included Jerry Kvidt (Athletic Business Manager), Kathy McCann (Assistant Athletic Director), Pete Oliszcak, (Assistant Athletic Director), and Lyle Beiswenger (Vice President for Finance).

### Meetings

The Intercollegiate Athletic Committee met on October 5, November 15, and January 10. Another meeting is scheduled March 28 with another to be scheduled in May. These meetings are held in the Conference Room at Hyslop.

### Summary of Activities

The regular business activities of the committee include:

1. Review and approval of minutes from the preceding meeting.
2. Review and acceptance of the monthly financial report, showing income from ticket sales, scholarships, student fees, guarantees, building rental, concessions and other miscellaneous income and expenses for administration, concessions, promotions, recruiting, scholarships, and each intercollegiate sport.
3. Approval of athletic schedules for each intercollegiate sport.
4. Approving recommendations for "letter winners" submitted by the coaching staff.



Members of the University Senate

March 24, 1994

Page 2

- 5. Strategic Planning. The Division has begun strategic planning in accord with the directive from the President. The Constituency Survey provided much important information for this activity.
- 6. Registrations for FY93. The Division recorded 20,752 enrollments for FY93.
- 7. Awards. Two national awards were received this year. Theron Nelson's course on real estate received national recognition as did the book on adult learners authored by H.B. Slotnick, M.H. Pelton, M.L. Fuller and L. Tabor.

RHB:JHK

Michael Meyer (Biology)  
 Barbara Wacker (Accounting)  
 John Hunsdon (Elec. Engineering)  
 Audrey Glick (Comm. Disorders)  
 James Adams (Psychology)  
 Kevin Fife (Comm. Disorders)  
 George Schubert (Institutional Representative)  
 Gordon Ceibla (Animal Husbandry)  
 Terry Samuels (Athletic Director)  
 Shari Seaman (Student Member)  
 Troy Winters (Student Member)

James Adams (Psychology)  
 Kevin Fife (Comm. Disorders)  
 James Adams (Accounting)  
 George Schubert (Institutional Representative)  
 Gordon Ceibla (Animal Husbandry)  
 Terry Samuels (Athletic Director)  
 Shari Seaman (Student Member)  
 Troy Winters (Student Member)

1. Review and approval of minutes from the preceding meeting.  
 2. Review and acceptance of the monthly financial report showing income and expenses for the month of February, 1994.  
 3. Review and approval of the monthly financial report showing income and expenses for the month of February, 1994.  
 4. Review and approval of the monthly financial report showing income and expenses for the month of February, 1994.

2. Dean's Evaluation. Dean Robert Boyd was evaluated by the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee on October 5, November 15, and January 10. Another meeting is scheduled March 28 with another set of evaluations. These meetings are held in the conference room at 1:30 p.m. in North Dakota. The Division has been given the right to include the Division in North Dakota. The Division has been given the right to include the Division in North Dakota. The Division has been given the right to include the Division in North Dakota.

University Senate  
 March 23, 1994  
 Page 2

5. Assist in the preparation of the next year's budget.
6. Review of administrative and coaching actions for consistency with University and Athletic rules and procedures.
7. Monitor NCAA and conference rules and actions to assure UND compliance.
8. Recognition of athletic excellence where and when appropriate.

### Concerns and Accomplishments

The Committee along with Peggy Lucke (Controller) and Denise Markovich (Finance) are currently studying the implementation of gender equity into athletics. This committee has met approximately ten times with additional meetings scheduled. At the conclusion of the study a report will be sent to the President with recommendations on how to improve opportunities in athletics for women.

Another major concern has been finding the means to balance the athletic budget. This is being monitored very carefully this year with the hope that this will be accomplished in spite of less appropriated funds and student fees.

Once again we can take pride on how our student-athletes have performed on the field, pool, and court. However, their performance in the classroom was even more amazing. The following report shows the activity, number of students, and GPA of all students participating in each of the sports for the Fall, 1993 Semester. This includes 237 student-athletes with a 3.00 GPA or better and 33 student-athletes with a 4.00 GPA.

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Term GPA</u>	
	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Average</u>
Baseball	39	2.70
Basketball-Men	17	2.87
Basketball-Women	14	3.13
Cross Country-Men	12	3.41
Cross Country-Women	12	3.59
Football	116	2.60
Golf-Men	16	2.69
Hockey	30	2.63
Softball	10	2.93
Swimming-Men	27	2.65
Swimming-Women	33	2.92
Track-Men	35	3.11
Track-Women	28	3.28
Volleyball	15	2.88
Wrestling	21	2.67
Athletic Training	42	3.26
Cheerleading	<u>28</u>	<u>2.52</u>
Total	495	2.93

## REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

## AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

March 24, 1994

## INTRODUCTION

On October 8, 1993 UND Senate Chair Carla Hess appointed Lonny Winrich, Bill Sheridan, and Bob King to an Ad Hoc Committee on Administrator Evaluation and charged the committee to perform the following tasks.

- 1) To review the history of administrator evaluation at UND.
- 2) To develop a rationale for routine administrator evaluation.
- 3) To recommend procedures for routine administrator evaluation.
- 4) To recommend criteria for use in administrator evaluations.
- 5) To project costs of administrator evaluations and identify sources of support for such evaluations.
- 6) To recommend if the Ad Hoc Committee on Administrator Evaluation should become a permanent committee of the Senate to be selected through the regular Senate elections process.
- 7) To report to the University Senate on or before its March 1994 meeting.

## HISTORY

The first responsibility of the committee, "To review the history of Administrator Evaluation at UND", was greatly facilitated by Ms. Linda Hurst of the Office of Academic Affairs. Ms. Hurst prepared a summary of University Senate and committee actions pertaining to administrator evaluation since 1972. The committee gratefully acknowledges her assistance in this area. Her summary is Attachment #1 to this report.

On April 6, 1972, the University Senate adopted the "Statement of Administrator Responsibilities" which appears in the faculty handbook and which forms the basis for the proposed evaluation questionnaire.

Between 1972 and 1977, several Senate committees were appointed to deal with the question of administrator evaluation. These committees generally made recommendations

regarding the mechanics of the evaluation process and the instrument used. At its October 6, 1977 meeting, the University Senate received the report of the Committee on Evaluation of Administrators. That report recommended an evaluation instrument and procedures which apparently governed administrator evaluation for nearly 10 years.

Meeting on April 22, 1987, the Council of Deans received a report from Mr. Richard Balsley showing that faculty participation in administrator evaluation by college ranged from 4.2% in CTL to 57.6% in Nursing. Overall participation was about 20%. This level of participation was perceived to be unsatisfactory and on February 19, 1988 Senate Chair Arne Selbyg suspended administrator evaluation pending revision of the process. Subsequently, the issue was discussed by the Senate Executive Committee on several occasions during 1988 but no conclusions were reached. During the 1992-93 academic year administrator evaluation was discussed informally by members of the Senate and Senate Executive Committee action on April 23, 1993 led to the formation of this committee.

#### RATIONALE

The rationale for routine evaluation of university administrators is not unique: evaluation is a useful tool for improving performance. Furthermore, this report should not be interpreted as inferring that because faculty, staff, and students do not participate, administrator evaluation is not currently done. Nevertheless, the statement of administrators' responsibilities which appears in the UND Faculty Handbook clearly identifies traits which are best evaluated by faculty and staff colleagues and by students affiliated with the department, college, or other unit of the university.

Among those traits are an adherence to democratic principles of administration, including:

"awareness of the nature of the student body and of the faculty's pedagogic concerns."

"Respect for individuals."

"The right of each individual affected by policy formation or alternation to have an equitable part in the determination of that policy."

"The exercise of fairness."

"The right of each individual to appeal decisions and actions affecting him or her and the right of the individual to be informed of avenues of appeal."

"In the exercise of these basic principles, the administrator should nurture an atmosphere of mutual trust

and honesty based on good communication."

This committee strongly recommends that evaluation of these qualities requires the reinstatement of faculty, staff, and student input to the evaluation of administrators.

#### PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

It is the opinion of this committee that the low level of participation in previous administrator evaluation procedures developed because of a lack of evidence that such procedures had any effect on the performance of the administrative staff. The committee further believes that the most effective means available to the Senate for assuring that administrators might modify their behavior in response to these evaluations is to report the results to the Senate in a public document. We therefore recommend the following.

Administrators should be evaluated annually by means of an anonymous questionnaire distributed and available as follows:

For Department Chairs, Academic Deans, Associates and Assistants, and School/College level administrators of academic support programs.

Distribute to faculty of the department and school/college.  
Available to staff and students.

For Non-academic Deans, directors, supervisors, Managers of academic support programs.

Distribute to staff and all faculty.  
Available to all staff, and students.

For the President, VPAA/Provost, other Vice Presidents, and their Administrative officers and support staff.

Distribute to Deans, Directors, and to all faculty.  
Available to all staff, and students.

The questionnaire used in previous administrator evaluations appropriately addresses the traits cited in our rationale. The Council of Deans has expressed the opinion that the evaluation form is acceptable (see Attachment #1). The committee recommends that the previous form be used and a copy of that form is Attachment #2.

Finally, it is recommended that the Senate form a standing committee on administrator evaluation to oversee this process. The responsibilities of this committee would be:

To work with the Office of Institutional Research to

distribute and tabulate evaluation forms on an annual schedule.

To recommend appropriate changes in the evaluation form and/or process in response to concerns and problems which might develop.

To report to the Senate the results of administrator evaluation annually. Initially, this Report should be scheduled for the April meeting of the Senate and the report should be a tabulation of results with no computation of summary statistics.

To develop an assessment of the cost of administrator evaluation.

#### COSTS

Of all the charges given to the committee, this one has been the most difficult to address. Basically we have failed to fulfill this responsibility and recommend that it be forwarded to the standing committee on administrator evaluation, assuming that such a committee is created by the Senate.

Without current, or reasonably recent, records of interest and response to administrator evaluation, we find it impossible to anticipate what costs might be incurred with any precision. Through the use of campus mail for distribution, The University Letter for publicity, and existing programs for tabulation of data, we believe that it is reasonable to implement the recommended process and to assess the costs after the fact. Initially, we see no alternative but to call upon the Provost to support such implementation through the Office of Institutional Research.

It should be noted that, as a result of a verbal agreement between Senate Chair Hess and Committee Chair Winrich, the reporting date for this committee was postponed to the April meeting of the University Senate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert King  
William Sheridan  
Lonny Winrich, Chair

## ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION CHRONOLOGY

April 6, 1972: The University Senate adopted the "Statement of Administrator Responsibilities."

May 3, 1973: The University Senate passed a resolution to elect an ad hoc committee of five members of the Senate to recommend procedures and instruments to evaluate university administrators in accordance with the previously adopted "Statement of Administrator Responsibilities."

January 17, 1974: An almost word-for-word motion (as appeared in the May 3, 1973, Senate minutes) was presented to the Senate to elect an ad hoc committee of five members of the Senate to recommend to it procedures and instruments to evaluate administrators in accordance with the previously adopted "Statement of Administrator Responsibilities." However, this time it was requested that the Committee on Committees prepare a ballot of nominees to present for voting upon at the next University Senate meeting.

February 7, 1974: The nominees for a Study Committee on the Evaluation of University Administrators were voted upon. The charge to the committee was that it make its report to the University Senate in May of 1974.

May 2, 1974: The ad hoc committee made the following recommendations to the Senate:

- 1) That the Committee on Committees appoint a committee to continue the work of the ad hoc committee with the intention of conducting an evaluation of UND administrators during the 1974-75 school year and the committee make a pre-evaluation report to the Senate in November of 1974;
- 2) That the proposed evaluation form on the Evaluation of Administrators be accepted (the proposed evaluation form was attached to the Senate minutes); and
- 3) That the Committee on Evaluation of Administrators consider a procedure under which an administrator would be evaluated once every three years (not to preclude more frequent evaluations if desired by the administrator or faculty, student and/or staff concerns warrant more frequent evaluations).

All three recommendations were voted upon and carried.

November 7, 1974

December 5, 1974

and

February 6, 1975: All three sets of minutes from these meetings make reference to the continuing work of the Committee on Evaluation of Administrators. Nothing was formally presented to the University Senate for action.

**May 1, 1975:**

A report of the Committee on Administrator Evaluation was presented to the University Senate. The report which was made part of the Senate minutes included the evaluation form, a statement of purpose and use of an evaluation program, suggestions regarding who is to be evaluated by whom and when, suggestions regarding "how to" evaluate, and other suggestions and recommendations. The vote to receive the report carried.

**April 1, 1976:**

The Committee on Committees was directed to appoint a committee to report to the Senate the following month, May 1976, on the implementation of the Final Report of the Committee on Administrator Evaluation which had been accepted by the Senate in May of 1975.

**May 6, 1976:**

The ad hoc Committee on Implementation of the Final Report of the Committee on Administrator Evaluation was presented. The Senate Executive committee was directed to appoint a committee to conduct administrator evaluations beginning fall semester, 1976.

**December 2, 1976:** It was reported to the Senate that because of changes in composition of the Senate Executive Committee, the appointment of a committee to conduct administrator evaluations was delayed. A committee would be appointed and charged with "sharpening the policy of the final report on administrator evaluation and implementing the evaluation during the spring of 1977."

**October 6, 1977:**

The report of the Committee on Evaluation of Administrators (dated September 19, 1977) was received by the Senate which was an attachment to the Senate minutes. The committee implemented the evaluation during spring semester, 1977, and offered several recommendations based on the reactions and suggestions that it had received concerning the process and the instrument.

**Much later...**

**April 22, 1987:**

At a Council of Deans meeting, the Office of Institutional Research presented data (an attachment to Council minutes of 4/22/87) which indicated the response to administrator evaluations was perceived as poor. Because administrative evaluation is a senate requirement, the Council recommended that the University Senate consider the value and evaluate the administrative survey for possible elimination.

**February 19, 1988:** Arne Selbyg, chair of Senate Executive Committee, directed the Office of Institutional Research not to distribute administrator evaluation forms until they could be revised. (Senate Executive Committee minutes)



**April 21, 1988:** The Senate Executive Committee moved to appoint a small committee of three administrators to come up with an evaluation process for recommendation.

**May 11, 1988:** The Council of Deans discussed the request from the Senate Executive Committee to appoint a committee of three administrators. The council did not find any problems with the form or the process, but rather with the participation level. The deans asked VP Clark to take this response back to the Senate Executive Committee.

**October 20, 1988:** The Senate Executive Committee moved to make a recommendation to reconsider the current policy on administrator evaluation (as the current instrument is not being used and therefore the data is not valuable) to the University Senate at its November 1988 meeting.

**November 3, 1988:** Based on the recommendation from the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate voted to direct the Committee on Committees to reconstitute the Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators and to offer a slate of nominees for the committee.

**March 4, 1993:** In a conversation with Mary Lou Fuller, who was chair of Committee on Committees in 1988, she stated that the committee had prepared a slate of nominees in response to the Senate's motion of November 3, 1988; however, was asked (by Arne Selbyg, chair of Senate) to hold off until he had gathered some information and/or talked with someone he knew.

**April 23, 1993:** Senate Executive Committee voted to establish an ad hoc committee to look at administrator evaluations.

Prepared and summarized by:

Linda G. Hurst from the Office of Academic Affairs

October 26, 1993

cmte\admeval.his

Name of administrator you are evaluating \_\_\_\_\_

In your opinion, how well do you know this person as an administrator?  
(Please check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ very well      \_\_\_\_\_ quite well      \_\_\_\_\_ somewhat      \_\_\_\_\_ just a little      \_\_\_\_\_ not at all

Please provide the following information:

Each administrator will be rated by several specified groups of raters who may perceive his performance differently. In order that your rating may be placed with the proper group of raters, please complete one of the following three (A,B, or C) sections.

A. STUDENT: Check once for each of two items.

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| 1) Classification | 2) Use services of administrator's office |
| Fr _____          | Often _____                               |
| Soph _____        | Sometimes _____                           |
| Jr _____          | Seldom _____                              |
| Sr _____          | Never _____                               |
| Grad _____        |   |

\*\*\*\*\*

B. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL: Check once for each of two items.

- |                      |                       |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1) Classification    | 2) College or School  |
| Faculty Member _____ | A&S _____ Law _____   |
| Administrator _____  | BPA _____ Med _____   |
|                      | CTL _____ Nurs _____  |
|                      | Engr _____ Univ _____ |
|                      | FA _____ Grad _____   |
|                      | HRD _____             |

\*\*\*\*\*

C. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL: Check one.

- 1) Classification
- Staff member \_\_\_\_\_
- Supervisor/Foreman \_\_\_\_\_
- Other administrator \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Each of the items below deals with characteristics of administrators or administrative staff members. Please indicate your rating of this administrator by checking the most appropriate point on the scale as to whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), are neutral (N), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with each statement. If the statement is not applicable or if you do not have sufficient information upon which to base an answer, please skip the next item. Complete the next two pages, then place in return envelope for campus mail.

A. In regard to democratic principles, this person:

- |   | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| (1) Assures participation by those affected in the formation and implementation of policies | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (2) Shows respect for individuals and their opinions  | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (3) Displays sensitivity and fairness in dealing with associates and staff                  | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (4) Encourages use of appeal routes by those questioning his or her decisions               | —  | — | — | — | —  |

B. In regard to administrative effectiveness this person:

- |  | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| (5) Works toward making sound decisions without undue delay  | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (6) Communicates with associates and staff members regarding their mutual efforts in achieving group goals | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (7) Is available   | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (8) Is responsive and flexible to changing needs   | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (9) Deals equitably with all persons regardless of sex, race, religion, or marital status                  | —  | — | — | — | —  |

C. In regard to professional qualities, this person:

- |   | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| (10) Encourages new ideas and innovative approaches                         | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (11) Stimulates and recognizes quality performance by associates and staff  | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (12) Keeps abreast of developments and conditions in area of responsibility | —  | — | — | — | —  |
| (13) Shows integrity, can be trusted to keep his/her word                   | —  | — | — | — | —  |

Directions: In this section, please rank this person on a scale of from 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor) on each of the six items below. Circle the number which you think is most appropriate:

D. How do you rate this person (?) as a(n):	Excellent					Poor
(1) Spokesman, presenting the views and decisions of others	5	4	3	2	1	
(2) Harmonizer, working to bring people to a consensus	5	4	3	2	1	
(3) Planner, anticipating problems, need and opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	
(4) Leader, meriting the respect and loyalty of others	5	4	3	2	1	
(5) Executive, efficiently and responsibly getting things done	5	4	3	2	1	
(6) Overall, I would rate this administrator as	5	4	3	2	1	

E. In your evaluation of this administrator are there particular observations or comments--positive or negative, on his or her strengths or weaknesses--which you wish to add to make this evaluation complete and more representative of your views? Please use the space below or other paper for additional comments. Your comments may be most helpful.