

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD  
ACADEMIC SENATE

**Administrator Review University Handbook**

RES 171814

FAC

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield recommend to the President that the University Handbook be revised as follows:

**311 EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS**

It is the policy of the CSU that academic administrators are evaluated at regular intervals. The faculty play a cooperative role with the administration in the review of administrative officers. A committee that examines and assesses the performance of the administrator and the office under review conducts the reviews. The review committee's evaluation and recommendations are undertaken with the purpose of improving management performance. Each review committee has the responsibility to protect the integrity of the review process. All committee deliberations shall remain confidential. Violations of this confidentiality shall be considered a breach of professional ethics. Trustee policy requires that the evaluation procedures include "the systematic acquisition of information and comments from appropriate administrators, faculty, staff, and students, on the work of administrators to be evaluated." Particular attention is given to the manner in which the administrator has met the needs and the goals of the University and its various constituencies.

**311.1 General Guidelines**

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three year intervals. The first review should be initiated early in fall semester after their initial hire. The President or the President's designee prepares the schedule of the evaluations. The President may, if he or she believes it is appropriate, call for an evaluation of an individual before a scheduled evaluation. The supervisor, after consulting with the administrator being evaluated, is responsible for developing the categories to be used for evaluating a director, dean, or academic vice president. (Revised 12-01-16)

**311.3 Review Committee Membership**

For review of the P&VPAA, the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs/Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of the Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (revised 07-10-17), and the Assistant Vice President for Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRASP), the review committee shall be as follows:

- A. The faculty of each school shall elect one tenured faculty;
- B. The President or the President's designee shall select a member of the Academic Affairs Council; and (Revised 12-01-16)
- C. The President or the President's designee shall choose a sixth member of the committee.

For review of the Dean of Arts and Humanities, Dean of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering, Dean of Business and Public Administration, Dean of Social Sciences and Education and Dean of University Library, the Dean of the Antelope Valley campus, the review committee shall consist of five eligible members.  
(Revised 12-01-16)

- A. The faculty of the school dean being reviewed, or the librarians in the case of the Dean of University Library, shall elect three (3) tenured faculty members or librarians. In the case of the Antelope Valley Campus Dean, an election shall be held to select three (3) representatives from the faculty, staff, and librarians who are at the Antelope Valley Campus. (Revised 12-01-16)
- B. The P&VPAA shall select a school dean; and
- C. The P&VPAA shall choose the fifth member of the committee.

Any prospective committee member with an active **grievance (or other legal proceeding) against the specific** Administrator under review at the time of review is not eligible for election or selection, and cannot serve on the review committee. **It is incumbent upon the committee leadership to ensure the eligibility of all elected members.**

The administrator under review may request that the supervisor of the review dissolve the review committee if one of its members is ineligible due to an active grievance (or other legal proceeding) against them, and the Senate will initiate a new election.

The administrator under review may challenge the membership eligibility of the review committee to avoid conflict of interest.

**RATIONALE:** A grievance is a confidential matter, and it is up to the faculty member involved to recuse himself or herself from a committee that reviews an Administrator ~~to avoid conflict of interest~~. It ought not be incumbent upon the Administrator under review to challenge the membership of the committee, although that option may be necessary. In that case, and in order to maintain confidentiality in the grievance, the entire committee is dissolved, and a new committee is formed.

**Distribution List:**

President  
Provost and VP of Academic Affairs  
AVP of Academic Affairs  
AVP of Academic Programs  
AVP GRASP  
School Deans  
Library Dean  
CSUB AV Dean  
EEGO Dean

Approved by the Senate March 8, 2018  
Sent to President March 16, 2018  
Approved by the President May 31, 2018