

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

April 2 and 9, 1979

MINUTES

First Session

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:00 p.m. with President Kleinman presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

Dale Buckmaster	John Crawford	William Moody
Thomas Church	Charles Marler	R.E. Howard

Senators excused were: Edith Anderson, Margaret Benner, William Boyer, Jeffrey Davidson, Alexander Doberenz, William Gaither, Barbara Kelly, David Lamb, David Lou, Anne McCourt, Mary Ann Miller, Elliot Schreiber, Jerold Schultz, E.A. Trabant, Robert Warren.

I. Adoption of the Agenda. President Kleinman requested consent to three changes in the Agenda: 1) withdrawal of Item A of New Business; 2) moving of Item B of New Business ahead of Old Business; and 3) adjournment of the meeting for one week if the Agenda were not completed at the meeting. In response to a request from Gary Cahill, Chair of the UDCC Constitution Committee, President Kleinman also asked consent to move New Business Item H to the first item of New Business. There were no objections and the Agenda was adopted with these changes.

II. Approval of the Minutes. Senate Secretary Sasser announced the following corrections to the Minutes of February 5 and 12: page 5, under "External Reviews," line 6 should read "that the candidate . . . and to whom"; under "Dossier Preparation," line 1, and under "External Reviews," line 1, "Vinson" should read "Vincent"; page 6, under "Numerical Vote," lines 1 and 4 should read "Vincent". For the Minutes of March 5: page 1, 9th line from the bottom and page 2, 4th line from the top, should read "Vincent"; page 2, last paragraph, 6th line from the bottom, should read "Provost Campbell responded that the Senate had the right to consider anything they wanted to. . . ." The Minutes of February 5 and 12 and March 5, 1979 were approved with these corrections.

IV. Announcements. President Kleinman announced that the Commission on Lifelong Learning has scheduled an Open Hearing for Thursday, April 26 in room 110 Memorial Hall, to receive comments and suggestions on the Commission's draft report.

He also announced that the Senate Computer Committee is currently reviewing the recently issued survey of the current status and future plans of the Computing Center, and they would welcome comments from the University community. Copies of the Survey may be requested through the Senate Office; comments may be sent to the Senate Office for forwarding to the Computer Committee.

President Kleinman announced a minor in Anthropology. In the absence of objections the minor was approved as printed in Attachment 1 of the Agenda.

Item B of New Business was considered next, following the revised Agenda. Prof. Gilbert, chair of the Committee on Research, introduced the revised University Policy on Inventions and reviewed the substantive changes in the Policy (see Attachment 2 of the Agenda). After a brief discussion the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the proposed revised University Policy on Inventions.

V. Old Business.

Item A, a recommended policy on suspension of faculty members, was introduced by Prof. Martin, chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges, who noted that the Senate had returned a suspension policy to the Faculty Welfare and Privileges Committee in May of 1978. He described the process the present Committee had gone through which had resulted in their proposing a single grounds for suspension as a penalty, in isolation from the ethical issues, but with the understanding that the Committee would monitor national developments and continue its discussion on ethical conduct of faculty. Senator Warter said he thought the conditions under which the proposed policy allowed suspension were situations which should be dealt with by police or security, rather than academic action. Dean Gouldner said the policy was unacceptable because 1) the proposed grounds for suspension--danger to one's self or others--are usually matters for civil authorities or a physician, and the proposed policy would have the suspension invoked by a dean, and 2) she felt such cases are best dealt with by the existing leave policy. Provost Campbell said the proposed policy was a "non-policy" because in not addressing the ethical issues it didn't address any of the reasons for which institutions need sanctions less than terminations. Prof. Martin explained that the functional word in the proposed policy was probably "only," and the Committee's intent was to stop the possible mischief of other kinds of suspension than the emergency situation. In the discussion that followed it was suggested that outside arbitration would be an appropriate course of action if it were a punitive suspension policy, and it was noted that although there are instances where suspension has been imposed, whether there is a governing policy at present is ambiguous. Senator Warter objected to defining the term in such a way that it could not be used in another context. The question was called and the Suspension Policy as recommended by the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges, was rejected by voice vote.

Item B, a recommendation for a change in the graduate student registration policy, was introduced by Prof. Morehart, chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies.

The following arguments were offered in favor of the proposed policy: 1) it would be cheaper for the graduate students because it would give them access to University facilities and faculty advisors for the cost of one credit instead of three; 2) it would facilitate keeping track of graduate students; 3) it would eliminate the present sustaining fee requirements; 4) it would eliminate the on-campus/off-campus designations and the need to monitor graduate student access to the library; 5) it would give credit to the faculty members who supervised students; 6) it allowed students who did not wish to enroll to request a leave of absence; 7) it would apply only to matriculated (fall and spring) students, and not to teachers enrolled only for the summer program; 8) the required one credit could be used for thesis or dissertation writing.

Arguments against the policy included: 1) part-time graduate students, such as those employed full-time, returning women students, and teachers, would be discouraged from matriculating at the University by a policy which forced them to enroll every semester; 2) in discouraging returning and part-time graduate students the policy was in opposition to University policy; 3) part-time students could not make use of the access to University facilities and faculty the proposed policy would provide every semester; 3) the policy would greatly increase the number of part-time advisees and one-credit special problems courses for faculty members; 4) the policy would debase the value of the one credit because it would tie it to a monetary consideration rather than an academic program.

A request to move the question was approved by unanimous voice vote; the proposed change in the graduate registration policy was then rejected by a voice vote.

Item C, a recommendation to change the Faculty Senate Policy Concerning the Use of Alcoholic Beverages by Students, was introduced by Prof. Kent, chair of the Committee to Regulate the Use of Beverage Alcohol. Prof. Kent called the Senate's attention to the amendments to the new policy, printed on the Agenda, which were approved when the item was originally introduced in the March Senate. The suggestion that the term "fraternity houses" (p. 4, part C) be changed to "fraternal organizations" was accepted as an editorial change. After a brief discussion Senator Finner moved the question; there was no objection and the resolution to approve the new policy as amended was then passed by unanimous voice vote. (The Policy as approved by the Senate is Attachment 1 of these Minutes.)

Item D, a resolution to change the charge to the University Review Committee for Academic Complaints, was introduced by Senator Sasser, chair of the Rules Committee. Senator Sasser explained that the change would bring the charge into conformity with the Academic Complaints Procedure in the current Collective Bargaining Agreement. There was no discussion and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the following to replace the first sentence of the existing charge to the University Review Committee for Academic Complaints in the Faculty Handbook:

This committee shall have the sole purpose of serving at Step 3 of the Academic Complaint Procedure in hearing the case and rendering its advisory decision to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

VI. New Business

Item H of New Business was introduced first under the revised Agenda. The recommendation for approval of the new student government constitution was introduced by Prof. Simons, chair of the Committee on Student Life. He called attention to the fact that the document the Committee was recommending for approval by the Senate (Attachment 5 of the Agenda) included three changes which had not yet been approved by the UDCC Constitution Committee. In response to a question from Senator Leavens, Prof. Simons said the Committee's approval was conditional on the acceptance of the

three changes and Mr. Cahill, chair of the Student Government Constitution Committee, agreed to this condition. University Treasurer Harrison expressed his concern that the document did not address the problem of who is responsible in student organizations in such areas as organizational deficits and bidding procedures. Senator Finner pointed out that the problem existed at present, and Prof. Simons said that those concerns could be spoken to in the Bylaws to the Constitution which were being drawn up. Senator Newman asked why the Constitution did not provide for proportional representation and Mr. Cahill responded that it would be too difficult to implement because the numbers of students in each group changed each year, and it was better to insure that each group was represented. The following was then approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the proposed new Student Government Constitution.

(Note: the Constitution, as approved by the Senate, is Attachment 5 of the April Senate Agenda.)

Item C, a request for confirmation of committee appointments, was introduced by Prof. Settles, chair of the Committee on Committees; there was no discussion and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

*Performing Arts Subcommittee - D. Pressley, member
(to replace T. Green)
- N. King, member
(to replace J. Symmons)*

Item D, a request from the Executive Committee to dismiss an ad hoc committee, was introduced by President Kleinman. There was no discussion and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate dismisses with thanks the ad hoc Committee to Study the University Promotions and Tenure Committee.

In response to an inquiry from Associate Provost Halio, President Kleinman said that the ad hoc Committee's report and a transcript of the Senate discussion had been sent to the Promotions and Tenure Committee and they would draw up recommendations for Senate action. Senator Oliver added that a Task Force to deal with problems in practice-oriented fields, as recommended by the ad hoc Committee, was being established.

Item E, a recommendation for final approval of a revised History major, was introduced by Prof. Thompson, chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. A suggestion for an editorial change, to add "of the History Department" at the end of part 3, was accepted. The following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the following new requirements for the major in History:

- 1. The revised thirty-hour major includes the following requirements:*

- a. H 101, 102 and 268;
 - b. Three credit hours in Ancient or Third World History;
 - c. Fifteen credits at the 300 level or above, with at least one of these courses at the 400 level or above;
 - d. Three credits, elective in History.
2. Advisement is mandatory for majors each semester.
 3. Exceptions may be granted upon petition to the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the History Department.

Item F, a recommendation for provisional approval of a Master's Degree in Bilingual Education, was introduced by Prof. Toensmeyer, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. Senator Braun suggested editorial changes, which were accepted, to remove references to "the Spanish Department" (which does not exist) and to correct "Department of Modern Languages and Literature" by removing the word "Modern." In response to Senator Braun's questions about the program's emphasis Prof. Scanlon, administrator of the program, said it was intended to include options which would attract students for whatever kinds of bilingual education for which there are job openings, and the program assumed that there is a pattern of socio-economically based problems that is similar in all bilingual classrooms. In response to an inquiry about language competencies of students in the program Senator Braun noted that the necessary competencies were prerequisite to the program's required courses. There was no further discussion and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves provisionally, for four years, the establishment of a Master's Degree in Bilingual Education.

(Note: the program as approved by the Senate is Attachment 3 of the April Senate Agenda, with the addition of the editorial changes noted above.)

Item G, a recommendation for provisional approval of a five year combined degree program in Engineering and Business Administration, was introduced by Prof. Toensmeyer, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. Dean Greenfield noted that all required courses for both degrees were included in the program; Associate Provost Halio expressed his concern that only three general education courses were included. There was no further discussion and the following was approved by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves provisionally, for four years, the establishment of a five-year combined degree program in Engineering and Business Administration (B.E./M.B.A.).

(Note: the program as approved by the Senate is Attachment 4 of the April Senate Agenda.)

The meeting was declared adjourned at 5:30, as agreed, for one week.

Second Session

The April meeting of the Senate was reconvened by President Kleinman at 4:00 on Monday, April 9. Senators not in attendance were:

William Boyer	R.E. Howard	Joseph Noggle
Dale Buckmaster	Lee Hyncik	Daniel Rich
John Crawford	David Lamb	Billy Ross
George Cicala	Anne McCourt	Blaine Schmidt
Alexander Doberenz	Mary Ann Miller	Elliot Schreiber
Richard Garvine	William Moody	Robert Warren

Senators excused were: T.E.D. Braun, Eric Brucker, L. Leon Campbell, Robert Carroll, Donald Crossan, Jeffrey Davidson, Paul Dragos, Stephen Finner, Helen Gouldner, Barbara Kelly, Dene Klinzing, David Lou, Charles Marler, John Pikulski, James Summerton, E.A. Trabant.

Item I, a report (Attachment 2) and recommendation from the Executive Committee for the establishment of an ad hoc Committee to Evaluate the President of the University was introduced. In response to an inquiry Senate Secretary Sasser determined that a quorum was present. Senator Schweizer asked about the status of the resolution calling for evaluation of administrative officers which was approved by the Senate in April, 1978. President Kleinman responded that that action still stands as a recommendation which was sent to the Board of Trustees; Prof. Woo, a member of the Board, added that it was a resolution to the Board from its Executive Committee rejecting the Senate's resolution which had been tabled by the full Board at its December meeting.

In response to questions about the actions of the Board of Trustees and its Executive Committee on the earlier Senate resolution, President Kleinman, who had attended both meetings, noted the following: 1) the Board was concerned about retaining its rights and did not want those rights diminished; 2) faculty opinions were valued by the Board and if the faculty decided to carry out an evaluation it would be proper and the Board would receive the results; 3) the faculty could carry out an evaluation with or without the Board's approval. He concluded that the Senate Executive Committee felt the present resolution incorporated the will of last year's Senate resolution and was consistent with what the Board would consider proper faculty prerogative. Vice President Geiger, who had also attended both meetings, added that the original motion of the Board's Executive Committee had been to reject the resolution, but that had been changed to "not approve of." He also said the Board's chief objection to the resolution had been that the President already undergoes continual evaluation through his contacts with members of the Board, especially the Board's Executive Committee.

Dean Gaither opposed the resolution because he felt such evaluations take a tremendous amount of time and money, and because they create an inquisition atmosphere; he added that a self-evaluation process helped get back to basic principles and to clear the air, but he said that on balance the evaluation process tended to make the institution look smaller.

Senator Warter said he thought it was important to secure the willing cooperation of the President in any evaluation process. He also said he did not feel outside consultation was necessary for this type of evaluation and he made a motion, which was seconded, to strike point 5 from the resolution. A COPE task force member attested to the positive experience of his group in using a consultant. Vice President Worthen said that although he objected to the phrase "consulting firm" in point 5 he could support having a president from another institution as a consultant.

President Kleinman moved to the motion to amend the resolution by striking point 5; the motion was defeated by a hand vote.

Senator Schweizer made a motion to amend point 5 by changing "consulting firm" to "consultant"; Senator Vincent's suggestion to change that to "consultant(s)" was accepted. Dean Gaither suggested adding "of comparable executive experience" and Senator Schweizer agreed. After a brief discussion President Kleinman called the question and the amendment to point 5, to read as follows, was approved by hand vote:

5. *that the University provide sufficient funds to engage an outside consultant(s) with executive experience comparable to that of a university president to advise the committee, but that the committee carry out its evaluation regardless of the availability of such funds;*

Senator Warter said he felt the evaluating committee should be broadened, and made a motion, which was seconded, to add "and three senior members of the faculty chosen by the group of past presidents" to point 2 of the resolution. Senator Schweizer suggested that the group should include a member of the Board; President Kleinman noted that the earlier Senate resolution, which called for Board of Trustees participation in the evaluation committee, had been rejected by the Board and that the Senate could not order the Trustees to participate. It was also noted that under point 3 of the resolution the Committee was directed to solicit input from other constituencies. President Kleinman called for the vote on Senator Warter's motion to amend point 2; the motion was defeated by hand vote.

Following a suggestion from Dean Greenfield the following motion was made and seconded: that in developing evaluation criteria the criteria will be brought to the Senate for its approval. Senators Sharnoff and Vincent opposed the amendment because they felt the quality of the Executive Committee's report was such that an ad hoc committee consisting of past presidents of the Senate could be relied upon to work within its framework. It was also objected that the amendment would tend to make the Committee's actions tentative, and would subject them to publicity. The motion to amend point 3 by the addition of "for approval by the Senate" was rejected by a hand vote.

Senator Schultz said he was opposed to the general resolution because, although he understood the need for confidentiality of the report, he could not appear to endorse a report without having seen it.

Senator Warter asked if the wording of point 6 meant that the final report would be given to individual Board members or to the Board as a group; President Kleinman said the recommendation was that it be sent to each member. Senator Warter made a motion that the words "members of the" be stricken from point 6. President Kleinman moved to the question and the motion was approved by hand vote to amend point 6 to read:

6. *that within one year the committee submit its report to the President and the Board of Trustees.*

A discussion followed on the availability and willingness of past presidents of the Senate to serve on the ad hoc Committee; President Kleinman said that none had refused. Dean Gaither made a motion to amend point 2 by the addition of the word "all" before "past presidents"; the motion failed for lack of a second.

A quorum count was requested and Secretary Sasser ascertained that a quorum was

present. President Kleinman moved to the question and the resolution from the Executive Committee, as amended, was approved by a hand vote, 29 for and 3 opposed. The resolution as approved follows:

- WHEREAS: *Formal periodic evaluation of chief administrative officers is recommended by many higher education organizations, including the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Association of University Professors, and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; and*
- WHEREAS: *such evaluations serve the interests of the University community by clarifying institutional goals and measuring progress toward them, by generating constructive advice for improving University Administration, and by providing relevant information to the Board of Trustees for its decisions concerning the leadership of the University; and*
- WHEREAS: *faculty participation in such evaluations is also recommended; and*
- WHEREAS: *no such formal evaluation has been carried out during President Trabant's tenure in office; and*
- WHEREAS: *the Board of Trustees has indicated willingness to consider seriously an evaluation initiated by the University Faculty Senate;*

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

- 1. that the Senate endorse the formation of an ad hoc committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the President of the University in the performance of his duties;*
- 2. that the ad hoc committee consist of past presidents of the University Faculty Senate;*
- 3. that the committee be empowered to select its chair, determine its operating procedures, formulate evaluation criteria, solicit input from all University constituencies, and devise and employ appropriate instruments to elicit such input;*
- 4. that the committee seek to involve the President in the evaluation at appropriate stages and seek presidential input on a preliminary version of the evaluation prior to completion of the final report;*
- 5. that the University provide sufficient funds to engage an outside consultant(s) with executive experience comparable to that of a university president to advise the committee, but that the committee carry out its evaluation regardless of the availability of such funds; and*
- 6. that within one year the committee submit its report to the President and the Board of Trustees.*

There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Sasser

Myron Sasser

Secretary, University Faculty Senate

MS/b

- Attachments: 1. Policy Concerning the Use of Alcoholic Beverages by Students
2. Report of the Executive Committee on Evaluation of the President

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
Newark, Delaware

Revised
FACULTY SENATE POLICY
CONCERNING USE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES BY STUDENTS
(approved by the Faculty Senate April 2, 1979)

The Policy:

"UNAUTHORIZED POSSESSION, USE, MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION OR SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON OR IN UNIVERSITY PROPERTY IS FORBIDDEN. University policy, consistent with state, county and city laws, restricts on-campus use of alcoholic beverages in specified areas."

The Philosophy:

The University of Delaware strives to offer members of the University Community the same rights and responsibilities as those afforded to members of the larger community.

Explanation:

- I. "Unauthorized" use will involve:
 - a. possession, use, manufacture or distribution in areas other than those enumerated in this policy; and/or
 - b. illegal possession, use, manufacture or distribution under the provisions of federal, state and city law.

- II. The University reminds all members of the University Community that violators of state law regarding the consumption, sale, possession or manufacture of alcoholic beverages are subject to legal action as follows:
 - 4 Delaware Code paragraph 904 makes it unlawful to purchase alcoholic liquor for or give it to a person under 20 years of age, and also makes it unlawful for a person under 20 years of age to consume alcoholic liquor or to have it in his possession. Both offenses are punishable by fine and consequently, by definition, are crimes against the State so that anyone who assists a person committing such a crime in order to hinder or prevent his apprehension, trial or punishment, would be an accessory after the fact.

Violations of 4 Delaware Code paragraph 904:

A fine of not less than \$100.00 nor more than \$500.00 for the first offense and fines of not less than \$500.00 nor more than \$1,000.00 for subsequent offenses.

The punishment for being an accessory after the fact is a fine of not more than \$1,000.00 or imprisonment for not more than three years or both.

- III. Student violations of this policy shall be referred to the University Student Judicial System and/or civil authorities.
- IV. Alcoholic beverages may not be possessed, consumed, or distributed in any University facility or property under the jurisdiction of the University unless the area has been designated by the President of the University or his designee as one where alcoholic beverages may be used.
- V. Individual transportation ("brown bagging") of alcoholic beverages is not permitted except in stadium parking areas on the days of home varsity football games.
- VI. Alcohol shall not be served at functions connected with academic programs or immediately preceding or during business meetings of any University student organization.
- VII. Open social functions involving the consumption of alcohol which are held out-of-doors by any fraternity or sorority house or residence hall are not permitted unless approved by the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration. Open social functions are defined as open campus events where an invitation is extended to all or a significant segment of the University members.

Implementation of the Policy

I. Off-Campus Activities:

The University accepts no responsibility for the use or distribution of alcoholic beverages at off-campus social functions sponsored by University-related organizations or individuals.

All persons planning or attending such an off-campus activity should be aware of the alcoholic beverage laws which apply to the situation. Each person participating in the activity assumes responsibility for his own actions.

Violations of pertinent alcoholic beverage laws will be handled by law enforcement authorities having jurisdiction over the specific location where the event is being held.

II. On-Campus Activities:

The use of alcoholic beverages is prohibited except when and where explicitly permitted by University policy.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
on the
EVALUATION OF THE PRESIDENT

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of performance is an activity which pervades higher education today. The primary goal of evaluation is constructive, providing a basis for correcting deficiencies and improving individual performance. While negative impact is not impossible, evaluation as it is practiced today does concentrate on the positive aspect of performance improvement and faculty generally accept this to be true even if they cannot be said as a group to be wildly enthusiastic about the degree to which it is presently pursued.

With the growing emphasis on accountability, the process of evaluation with input from interested constituencies has extended from faculty to administration, including the chief administrator. In the early 1970s there was a growing concern in higher education that the pressures on college presidents were so great that many of the gifted individuals needed to lead our universities were in fact choosing to leave or not accept presidencies. One way of reaffirming confidence in a president is through a formal periodic review. Although the process requires care lest the evaluation be threatening or degrading, the idea of a periodic performance review has won widespread support, not only as being the best vehicle for a president to review his mandate, but also as a responsible activity of the board of trustees.

NEED FOR PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION

The move toward presidential evaluation has been rapidly growing in the past ten years. In 1970, Clark Kerr wrote (1):

Most important, I believe, among changes is to place the president on a term appointment of reasonable length. This will give him, except under exceptional circumstances, a fixed period on which he can plan. At the end of the term, he will have an easy opportunity to review his own desires and for others to review his conduct. If he is reappointed, he will have received a reaffirmation of his authority as he meets new crises.

According to Robert Gale (2), president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, "One thing that there is general consensus on is that a formal evaluation procedure at regular intervals is very helpful." In writing on the responsibilities of trustees, John Nason (3) notes that:

Having selected the president, the board has a continuing responsibility to make certain that performance matches expectation. At some points a president needs strong backing from the board; at others, guidance and correction. Presidential performance must be evaluated, not casually, but in accordance with objective and acceptable criteria.

Where performance is unsatisfactory and shows little likelihood of improvement, trustees should reach the decision to change administrations before a crisis blows up in their faces. A quietly arranged departure is kinder to both the individual and the institution.

At its fifteenth annual meeting in 1975, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities adopted a policy statement (4) saying in part: "It is recommended that the governing boards of colleges and universities establish procedures for a periodic and systematic evaluation of institutional presidential performance which considers the broad span of leadership requirements for the particular institution." Of course there are still many institutions that have yet to implement presidential evaluation procedures and some boards that have yet to recognize the need. As George Potter (5), a state college trustee in Michigan observed: "Unfortunately, although all boards recognize the necessity to choose and perhaps fire the president, many do not recognize the need to evaluate his performance regularly." Presidents at Haverford and Scranton for example (6), (7) had to overcome initial reluctance on the part of the board when they insisted that their performance be subject to a formal in-depth evaluation.

A danger in evaluation at any level is that of the process degrading rather than enhancing the position being evaluated. Therefore there is all the more reason, according to Joseph Kauffman (8), "for a sensitive evaluation process that rewards and reinforces excellent performance and enables the system to get and keep superior executives. Any personnel process that does not do this is a failure." However Barry Munitz, who served on a University of Illinois administrative evaluation task force and coordinated a three-year presidential workshop study supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, reported (9) that:

Both study groups are convinced that the benefits derived from a formal evaluation process outweigh the liabilities. A provision for the explicit assessment of administrators is a significant contribution to an effectively operating university; and while the various informal or *ad hoc* kinds of evaluation which exist today are useful, they are not

A. Student Organizations:

Student organizations shall have the opportunity to serve alcoholic beverages at social functions held in approved University locations to those of legal age. The procedures listed below must be followed to obtain the use of University facilities for such functions:

1. Functions sponsored by University student organizations and held in University facilities at which alcoholic beverages are to be served must be registered (see below). Such functions must be limited in attendance to members of the organizations and their invited guests.
2. Groups in good standing as sponsoring organizations (i.e., free of censure or restriction that would prohibit that organization from sponsoring said function) who are thereby entitled to use University facilities and desire to serve alcoholic beverages at private events scheduled in University facilities will be permitted to do so upon submitting written guarantee that the proper procedural safeguards have been adopted by them so that state and local beverage laws and University regulations will not be violated. At the time any reservation for service and consumption of alcoholic beverage is made, a person authorized to sign for the group making the reservation must complete and sign a notice form which states that the group is using the University facilities for a private party or meeting limited in attendance to members or guests of the named person, group, association or organization as authorized in conformance with federal, state, city ordinances and University regulations.

B. Residence Halls:

1. Individual Actions -

- a. Students of legal age and their guests of legal age may possess and consume alcoholic beverages on an individual basis in the privacy of their residence hall rooms.
- b. The possession and consumption of alcohol shall not infringe upon the privacy and peace of other individuals. Any such infringement shall be considered a violation of the Code of Conduct and shall be dealt with in the manner prescribed in the University Student Judicial System. In all such situations the consumption of alcoholic beverages will be considered as aggravating rather than mitigating the situation.
- c. The Office of Housing and Residence Life shall continue to provide procedures for permitting students to select to live with someone who does not wish to use alcoholic beverages in his or her room.

2. Group Functions -

Possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages in any areas other than individual rooms is forbidden; however the Office of Housing and Residence Life may establish procedures, within the limits of the University Policy, for the dispensing of alcoholic beverages for group functions in other areas of the residence halls.

Faculty Senate Policy
Concerning Use of Alcoholic Beverages by Students

4

C. Fraternal Organizations:

The principles outlined above apply equally to these living units. The Council of Greek Presidents under the direction of the Office of the Dean of Students shall establish procedures whereby individual fraternal organizations shall implement and enforce this policy.

D. General Procedures:

1. Student Organizations holding social functions sponsored or sanctioned by the University have the opportunity of serving alcoholic beverages in certain areas of the following: Christiana Commons Buildings, Clayton Hall, Dining Halls, Pencader Dining Commons, Faculty Dining, Blue and Gold Club, Goodstay, Student Center, Wilcastle, and other areas designated by the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration. Outside functions involving the use of alcohol are not permitted on the campus with the exceptions noted in Sections V and VII.
2. Functions at which alcoholic beverages are to be served must be registered with the person in charge of the facility in which the event is to be held. The registration officers are as follows:
 - a. Christiana Commons Building -- Associate Director of Residence Life (5 Courtney Street)
 - b. Clayton Hall, Goodstay, Wilcastle -- Associate Director of Continuing Education for Conferences (John M. Clayton Hall)
 - c. Faculty Dining Room, Pencader Dining Commons, and Dining Halls -- Associate Director of Food Service (503 Academy Street)
 - d. Blue and Gold Club -- Manager, Blue and Gold Club (44 Kent Way)
 - e. Student Center -- Associate Director of the Student Center
3. Events at which alcoholic beverages are served/sold must be sanctioned by the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration. To be sanctioned, an officer of the organization requesting the privilege to serve alcoholic beverages must submit to the person in charge of the facility in which the event is to be held a written guarantee that the proper procedural safeguards have been adopted, that all local, state and federal laws and regulations will be followed, and that the group using the University facilities intends to limit attendance to members and bona fide guests invited prior to the holding of the event.

sufficient. The president's office, which must set the standards and tone that lead an institution toward excellence, should set the first example for systematic review.

In arguing for increased administrative authority to cope with the problems of the late sixties and early seventies, Charles Lindahl (10) nevertheless concluded that: "Accountability is the natural concomitant of authority and responsibility. There can be carefully defined post-audit provisions which assure effective assessment of administrative performance. . . . At periodic intervals the administrator should be evaluated on the basis of criteria mutually arrived at with his pre-audit group." The view that the president should have the power to act but that his actions should be subject to review was perhaps most dramatically stated by Kingman Brewster (11), then president of Yale:

The principle of executive accountability as the price which must be paid for the exercise of executive discretion has, up to now, been formally limited to the power of the trustees to fire the man they hired as president. This is a terribly limited and inhibited power, since it cannot be exercised without running contrary to the expectation of a lifetime tenure.

The essence of the problem is that, while there is legal accountability to the trustees, there is no orderly way in which those most significantly affected by maladministration can invoke trustee action within measurable time, without open challenge to the stability of the institution and the integrity of its processes.

It seems to me that the only way this problem can be solved is to require the periodic, explicit renewal of a president's tenure. I happen to think that ten or twelve years or so is about enough anyway, although there is no generalization valid for all times and places and people.

I think Yale would be better off if it were understood that the trustees would make a systematic reappraisal and explicit consideration of the president's reappointment at some specified interval. This might be seven years after the initial appointment, perhaps at a somewhat shorter interval thereafter. I would urge the trustees right now to consider adoption of such a policy.

Such an attitude on the part of a president certainly eases the process of establishing an evaluation process. Indeed, according to Garry Hays (12), chancellor of the Minnesota State University System and architect of the "Minnesota Plan" for presidential evaluation: "Aside from the between-presidents timing, the best time to develop a policy [for evaluation] is when a board has a good executive"; and he goes on to say that "good presidents are not threatened by discussions of such a policy." On the other hand, it has been observed

that (13) "the administrator who does not seek and accept evaluation of his own activity is on dubious ground when he insists that his faculty undergo such evaluation."

FACULTY ROLE IN EVALUATION

The legal responsibility for ultimate decision making regarding presidential leadership rests with the board of trustees. However the principle of shared authority imposes an obligation upon the trustees to consider inputs from the president's various constituencies and an obligation on the faculty in particular to provide the trustees with an objective assessment based on its own unique perspective. This is stated clearly in the American Association of University Professors' "Statements on Faculty Participation in the Selection and Retention of Administrators" (14):

With respect to the chief administrative officer, the 1966 Statement [on Government of Colleges and Universities] specifies that the "leadership role" of the president "is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty." His retention of authority, like his acquisition of it, should be subject to the confidence in which he is held by faculty and board. Rather than assuming that he has acquired *de facto* tenure in his position as president, some system should be sought which would reflect from time to time the level of confidence he enjoys.

Such a system might take the form of a term appointment, near the end of which the president's term could be reviewed by formal or informal agreement, and he could be reappointed for another term or not be reappointed. Alternatively, at the request of either the board or the faculty, a joint review of his status might be made.

In this same vein a Carnegie Commission study (15) concluded that "Boards may wish to consider the establishment of stated review periods for presidents so that withdrawal by the president or reaffirmation of the president may be managed in a more effective manner than is often now the actual situation. Faculty members and students should be associated in an advisory capacity with the process of review as they are in initial appointment." Faculty representation on the evaluation team is also recommended in the models proposed by Anderson (16), Hays (17) and Surwill and Heywood (18).

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The prevailing body of opinion as to what actually should be evaluated focuses on measuring progress toward some clearly defined set of goals. However it is recognized that unanticipated developments may occur which could alter or create new goals. Performance in such areas, as well as the decisions

to devote attention to them, should also be evaluated. One radical proposal (19) suggests that evaluators not be informed of original goals so as not to be prejudiced against accomplishments in unexpected areas, but this concept of "goal free evaluation" has not gained wide acceptance.

The fact of changing goals is offered as another reason for periodic evaluation, in that it provides the opportunity to update presidential and board expectations. David McKenna (20) suggests:

. . . a three-to-five-year evaluation should be planned to assess a president's effectiveness. Once the performance goals for the man and the institution have been defined, evaluation is a natural process. As it is now, presidents may have contracts or agreements, but they serve at the pleasure of the board. Under this system, presidential evaluation is a whimsical and emotional process which swings from character investigations to sentimental testimonials. Performance goals and planned evaluations will put some stability into the system and take some emotion out of the process. Rather than evaluating a president by likes and dislikes, his effectiveness should be measured by the degree to which he has met the performance goals which were agreed upon at the time of his selection.

Obviously, these goals will change with the evolving scene in higher education. Such changes should not become "hidden expectations" of the institution or "hidden aspirations" of the president. Rather, through open communication, modifications in performance goals should be discussed and recorded, in conjunction with the president's reports to the board. Evaluation, in a larger context, should take place in three-to-five year cycles.

While a listing of goals is a feature of most evaluation models, care must be exercised to ensure that they are significant since (13):

Statements of goals often have little meaning because they are written to impress rather than give direction. . . . carefully developed statements of policy and procedure which give the appearance of effective planning and administration are so ambiguous that they can be read or perverted to suit the pressures of the moment.

In addition to measuring progress toward agreed upon goals a variety of evaluative criteria have been suggested. In Anderson's model (16):

The review will be qualitative and judgmental. It will be based on criteria of the following type: (1) performance as an educational leader; (2) performance as a manager of

the enterprise entrusted to him/her; (3) criteria related to personality, health, energy, personal values, and administrative style; (4) educational statesmanship; (5) criteria related to astuteness or sophistication in affairs that are political, economic, social, or involving interactions with other persons on or off campus; (6) criteria that are related to institutional uniqueness; and (7) criteria that reflect special attributes of either the institution or the administrator. Finally the report will deal with any special limitations or great strengths of the administrator that appear critical to the college's or university's welfare.

In a survey of member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Surwill and Heywood report (18) that fourteen percent already have formal evaluations of the president and many more are planning to inaugurate them. They list forty-five characteristics (many redundant) which institutions used in evaluations, including: ability to work with people, ability to supervise others, quality of academic leadership and management, accessibility and approachability, budget management skills, communication abilities, decision making ability, delegation of authority, demonstration of self-confidence, effective use of staff, encouragement of faculty to advance ideas, quality of faculty personnel decisions, establishment of institutional direction and tone, ability to involve others in an appropriate manner, etc.

An even larger list of criteria is provided in Hays' Minnesota Plan (17); here criteria are subsumed under the broad categories of problem solving and decision making, personnel, academic planning and administration, fiscal management, student affairs, external relations, and relationship to the board. A different emphasis is observable in the Haverford evaluation of President Coleman (6) which identified for evaluation the areas of administrative ability, relations with various segments of the Haverford community, personal qualities--objectivity, fairness, humaneness, sensitivity, honesty, openness,--commitment to scholarship and academic excellence, commitment to Quaker values/moral dimensions, commitment to the college as an institution, and quality of leadership and decision making ability. Another not dissimilar list of evaluation criteria is included in Munitz's evaluation model (9).

An equally valuable list of negative criteria is given by Dressel (21):

Criteria indicative of unsatisfactory administrative performance today are of two types; unfortunate attitudes or sheer incompetence on the part of the administrator and a tendency to bypass him or her. The first category includes such attitudes as: expects strong personal loyalty and support; cannot or will not tolerate lengthy discussion or dissent regarding one's own ideas or extended controversy over any issue; ignores or bypasses others without clearance or explanation; depends overly much on the advice of a few immediate associates; basks in praise and does not differentiate between university and one's self in

accepting it; blames others for errors or weaknesses; does not encourage or assist able individuals to advance themselves either within the institution or by moving to another one. Such traits reflect a highly self-oriented approach to administration which arouses distrust and opposition.

OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS

Although not always agreeing on the precise role, most writers on evaluation stress the desirability of involving an outside consultant. Reverend Hanley (7) suggests that a competent consultant be invited "to discuss procedures and to facilitate understanding and expedite outcomes. There are too many dangers to walk this path without guidance." Whether the consultant has primary responsibility for the evaluation or serves in an advisory role varies from model to model. Munitz (9) proposes that the consultant play a central role in the evaluation, developing assessment criteria and evaluation strategy, participating in interviews of constituency groups and participating in the preparation of the final report. In the Minnesota Plan (12), the consultant actually determines the extent and manner of constituency involvement in the evaluation.

The rationale is evident. Although the board has the ultimate responsibility, it is and probably should be removed from many of the university activities, and board members generally do not have continuing first-hand professional experience in higher education. While the constituency groups--faculty, students, administration, alumni, and external community--have varying insights and experience with presidential activities which are essential to the board for responsible decision making, the objectivity and balance that a disinterested trained observer can bring to bear in assembling and weighing the messages from the many competing voices can be invaluable. Because of the sensitivity of the process an experienced consultant may help avoid pitfalls that could compromise the utility of the evaluation.

CONFIDENTIALITY

There is almost universal agreement that evaluation should not be carried out in public. The desirability of confidentiality is recognized in personnel evaluations at all other levels in the university and there is even more reason to observe it with respect to presidential evaluation because of the president's high public visibility. In some evaluation models a general report is made to the community, but the more sensitive criticisms are confined to the committee, the board and the president. Anderson (16) recommends that "the nature of the review process generally shall be known but . . . its results concerning any given individual are to remain confidential." McKenna (20) also cautions "a presidential evaluation should be community-wide but controlled to assure representative opinion. It should be made clear that the results will be used only in confidential session." Perhaps the most telling argument in favor of confidentiality is implicit in the report of Elizabeth Brown (22) of the evaluation at Brooklyn College where confidentiality was not observed and there was "a

great disparity between the efforts they have expended and the results they have achieved."

THE DELAWARE SITUATION

President Trabant has been in office for eleven years. During that time there has been no formal objective evaluation of his performance. According to its chairman, the Board of Trustees--and in particular the Board's Executive Committee--constantly evaluates the president through his contact with board members. This is one of the informal or *ad hoc* evaluation methods which Munitz (9) and others previously cited find insufficient.

Although periodic review procedures have been put in place for all faculty members, including tenured faculty, chairpersons and directors, and a major periodic evaluation of dean's has been implemented, no such formal evaluation program exists at higher administrative levels. The Faculty Senate moved to extend the advantages of formal evaluation to these positions when, after lengthy debate, the Senate in April of 1978 passed the resolution:

Resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommends that, as is currently the case for chairpersons and program directors, all administrative officers with major responsibilities for academic programs and policies, including Deans, the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President, shall undergo a major evaluation of their performance during every fifth year that they have served in office. Existing procedures shall be used for the evaluation of Deans.* Committees evaluating other administrative officers shall consist of six persons, three of whom shall be directly appointed by the Board of Trustees and three of whom shall be nominated by the University Faculty Senate upon recommendation of its Executive Committee, and be appointed by the Board of Trustees. Evaluations of the Vice Presidents and the Provost shall be made available to the President. Evaluations of the President shall be made available to members of the Board of Trustees. The evaluation shall begin at the earliest possible date.

*"Evaluation of Performance of Deans," March 10, 1975

This recommendation was transmitted by the President to the Chairman of the Board. The Executive Committee of the Board recommended rejecting the evaluation proposal; however, the full Board, at its meeting of December 2, 1978, voted to table the matter. During that meeting it was brought out that the Faculty Senate was not only free to carry out its own evaluation, but that the Board would receive such a report.

In view therefore of this Board position, a faculty initiative in evaluation can not be discounted as a fruitless enterprise. Moreover there is an

overwhelming body of thoughtful support for evaluation from leaders in higher education, representing views of governing boards, administration and faculty. That these different groups agree so strikingly is a measure of their shared dedication to institutional well being.

While the ultimate responsibility lies with the board, the faculty cannot share in institutional governance without also accepting institutional responsibilities. One of these is to provide to the President and the Board as complete, fair and objective an evaluation of the President as is possible. Whether or not the Board agrees or disagrees with the evaluation or even whether or not it accepts or rejects the concept of formal periodic review should not affect the faculty's obligation to act in what it believes to be the best interests of the University. In doing so it contributes to solving "one of the problems of administration in higher education [which] is that it ought to provide to its students a model of the judgmental decision making process which it is trying to inculcate in those students" (13).

University Faculty Senate
Executive Committee

Reed Geiger
Ralph E. Kleinman, Chair
John J. Pikulski
Myron Sasser

FOOTNOTES

1. Clark Kerr, "Presidential Discontent," in Perspective on Campus Tension, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1970), 152-3.
2. Robert Gale, A Future With Quality, (Washington: Association of Governing Boards Reports, Jan/Feb 1978), 4-7.
3. John Nason, The Trustee's Ten Responsibilities, (Washington: Association of Governing Boards Reports, Jan/Feb 1976), 45-48.
4. Guidelines for Conditions of Employment for College and University Presidents, (Washington: AASCU, 1975), ED 121169.*
5. George Potter, "Responsibilities: Enhancing Trustee Effectiveness," in Victoria Dziuba and William Meardy, (eds.), New Directions for Community Colleges, 15 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976).
6. Private communication, letter from Stephen Cary, Vice President of Haverford; and "Report of the Presidential Evaluation Committee of the Board of Managers," available on request.
7. Dexter Hanley, Evaluating a President, (Washington: Association of Governing Boards Reports, March/April 1975), 42-47.
8. Joseph Kauffman, "Presidential Assessment and Development," in New Directions for Higher Education, 22 (1978), 59-69.
9. Barry Munitz, Presidential Evaluation: An Assessment of Institutional Leadership, report to the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, March 1976 (copies available from AGB Trustee Information Clearinghouse). See also, Munitz, Measuring a President's Performance, (Washington: Association of Governing Boards Reports, Jan/Feb 1976), 36-40.
10. Charles Lindahl, "Reaffirmation of Administrative Authority," Liberal Education, 58 (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges Quarterly, 1972), 524-532.
11. Kingman Brewster, "Accountability," in Immanuel Wallerstein and Paul Starr, (eds.), The University Crisis Reader, (New York: Random House, 1971), 506-509.
12. Garry Hays, Evaluating a President: The Minnesota Plan, (Washington: Association of Governing Boards Reports, Sept/Oct 1976), 5-9.
13. Asa Knowles (ed.), Handbook of College and University Administration, vol. 3 (New York: McGraw Hill, 1970), 70-73.
14. "Faculty Participation in the Selection and Retention of Administrators," AAUP Bulletin (Winter, 1974), 414-415.

* ED citations are available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service

Footnotes

15. Governance of Higher Education - Six Priority Problems, (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Report, April 1973). See also, A Digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, p. 38.
16. Lester Anderson, The Evaluation of Academic Administrators; Principles, Processes, and Outcomes, (Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1975), ED 129198.*
17. Garry Hays, Evaluating a President: Criteria and Procedures, (Washington: Association of Governing Boards Reports, Nov/Dec, 1976), 41-46.
18. Benedict Surwill and Stanley Heywood, Evaluation of College and University Top Brass: the State of the Art, status report of AASCU Member Institutions, (Aug, 1976), ED 129142.*
19. Michael Scriven, "Prose and Cons about Goal-Free Evaluation," Journal of Educational Evaluation, vol. 3, (UCLA: Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1972), 1-7.
20. David McKenna, "Recycling College Presidents," Liberal Education, 58 (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges Quarterly, 1972), 456-463.
21. Paul Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation, (Sand Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), 389.
22. Elizabeth Brown, "Faculty Evaluation of Administrators at Brooklyn College," AAUP Bulletin, 64, 4 (1978), 298-304.