

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 198

HE 008 290

AUTHOR Anderson, G. Lester
 TITLE The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes.
 INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
 SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
 PUB DATE 75
 NOTE 76p.
 AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$4.67 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Administrative Personnel; Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Evaluation; Committees; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Higher Education; *Models; *Presidents; Self Evaluation; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

A model is presented and interpreted by which college and university boards of trustees periodically assess and evaluate key academic administrators, including presidents, vice presidents, and deans. Evaluation is defined as a process of review to assess the performance of academic administrators and to make a value judgment concerning this assessment. Such review involves the assessment of actual performance, management activity, quality of leadership, and other activities and attributes. The model makes use of an ad hoc evaluation committee that prepares an assessment portfolio. This portfolio contains a self-evaluation statement by the person under review, descriptive and evaluative statements representing the valid interests of various constituencies, and a consensus statement as well as a dissenting or minority statement if any. The board of trustees reviews the assessment portfolio and makes its own definitive evaluation. The review is qualitative and judgmental, based on specific criteria. It deals with any special limitations or great strengths of the administrator that appear critical to a college or university's welfare. (LBH)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

THE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS:
PRINCIPLES, PROCESSES, AND OUTCOMES

Prepared for

The Presidents' Personnel Committee
Council of Presidents of the Pennsylvania
State Colleges and University

The President and Provost
The Pennsylvania State University

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AND WELFARE
RESEARCH INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITY CITY, PA 19104

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
AND WELFARE
RESEARCH INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITY CITY, PA 19104

G. Lester Anderson
Professor of Higher Education
Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Copyright © The Pennsylvania State University, 1975

CONTENTS

<i>Preface and Acknowledgments</i>	v
Part I. Synopsis	1
Part II. Introduction: Why Evaluation?	3
Rationale for Administrator Evaluation	3
Scope of the Monograph	4
Types of Evaluation	6
The Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee: A Model	7
Assumptions Basic to Academic Administrator Evaluation	8
Part III. A Process for Formal Evaluation	9
Who Evaluates and Why	9
Uses of the Evaluation	9
Need for a Formal Evaluation System	10
Caveats Regarding the Formal System	11
The Frame of Reference for Evaluation	13
Locus of Authority for Evaluations	15
Responsibilities of Boards of Trustees and Presidents	20
The Assessment Portfolio	21
Due Process in Administrative Evaluations	21
Part IV. Conducting the Evaluation: Conditions and Criteria	23
Complex Role and Environment of Presidential Functioning	23
Some Dicta and Caveats	26
Further Caveats	27
Criteria for Evaluation	27
Unique Criteria	32
The Criteria Situation—A Summing Up	33
Part V. Guidelines for Appraisals	35
Responsibilities of Constituent Members of the Evaluation Committee	36
Final Responsibilities of the Committee as a Whole	38

Contents (cont.)

Part VI. Resource Materials for Academic Administrator Evaluation	39
<i>Exhibit 1:</i> Elements of a President's or Other Administrator's Self-Analysis	41
<i>Exhibit 2:</i> Performance Activities as Evaluation Areas	43
<i>Exhibit 3:</i> Descriptors: A Shopping List	46
<i>Exhibit 4:</i> Managerial Competency: Descriptors	48
<i>Exhibit 5:</i> Administrator Understanding of the Academic Enterprise	49
<i>Exhibit 6:</i> Descriptions of Administrator Roles	51
<i>Exhibit 7:</i> Other Descriptions of Administrator Roles	53
<i>Exhibit 8:</i> Literature Review and Bibliography	68

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This monograph has been prepared under the general supervision of the Personnel Committee of the Council of State College and University Presidents of Pennsylvania. Members are: Frank Hamblin, Chairperson, Gilmore Seavers (until September 1975), James Gemmell (after September 1975), Albert A. Watrel, Sally Lied, Robert Gaylor, and Bernard Edwards.

A stipend made available by The Pennsylvania Department of Education financed out-of-pocket expenses and the employment of a graduate assistant half-time for two terms in support of the project. The writer prepared this monograph as a part of his service as Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University. The writer wishes to acknowledge the considerable assistance of James Voelker, graduate assistant in the Center, in the preparation of this monograph. The members of the Personnel Committee approved of the general structure of the monograph and contributed many elements of detail. Numerous other persons, including members of the Center staff and Dr. Joseph Kauffman, Dr. Foster Buchtel, and Dr. Fred F. Harclerod, consultants for the project, made many criticisms of outlines and suggestions for the monograph. However, this writer bears the sole responsibility for the content of this statement.

PART I. SYNOPSIS

This monograph presents and interprets a model by which college and university boards of trustees periodically will be able to assess and evaluate key academic administrators—both presidents and others such as vice presidents and deans.

Evaluation is defined as *a process of review to assess the performance of academic administrators and to make a value judgment concerning this assessment*. Such review involves the assessment of actual performance, management activity, quality of leadership, and other activities and attributes to be delineated later.

It is an assumption basic to this presentation that evaluation is a proper function of a board of trustees accountable for the tenure of an institutional president and of the president who is accountable for the tenure of other senior academic administrators. Likewise, it is assumed that the board of trustees of a given institution will specify the conditions under which evaluation occurs in relation to such matters as presidential and other administrator contractual obligations or tenure and will establish a cycle of review and general conditions that will maintain the integrity of the process.

The model for evaluation presented in this monograph is a modification of the *search committee* model now used in colleges and universities to seek out faculty and administrators for appointment.

The modified model makes use of an *ad hoc evaluation committee*. This committee will normally have members drawn from boards of trustees (primarily used in presidential evaluations), other academic administrators, faculty, students, and alumni. This membership can be readily modified to accommodate other constituencies or to achieve a better balance, for example, for the sexes and ethnic or racial groups.

The ad hoc evaluation committee will prepare what is called an assessment portfolio. The initial item to be placed in the portfolio will be a self-evaluation statement submitted by the person under review. The portfolio will, however, consist largely of descriptive and evaluative statements representing the valid interests of the various constituencies. It also will contain a consensus statement with dissents or minority statements, if any, of the entire committee.

For the presidential review, the board of trustees will review the assessment portfolio and make its own evaluation which will be definitive. This evaluation, with the portfolio, will be reviewed with the president. For presidential evaluations in Pennsylvania's State Colleges and University, the review statement with the definitive evaluation will be sent to the chairperson of the State Colleges and University Board of Directors. A copy will be sent to the Secretary of Education of the Commonwealth.

For reviews of all other academic administrators, the president or his/her designee will review the assessment portfolio and make his/her own evaluation which will be definitive. This evaluation with the portfolio will be reviewed by the president with the administrator under review. The final and definitive evaluation will then be sent to the board of trustees.

The board of trustees, on recommendation of the president, will determine the administrators who shall be considered academic and subject to evaluation. The monograph presents a plan for further review or filing of an appeal by any administrator, including the president, when the administrator concludes that the review and definitive evaluation significantly misinterprets the confidence he/she believes he/she merits.

It should be obvious that 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 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.

The nature of these criteria and how they may be reported are dealt with at some length in the monograph.

The monograph also sets forth the following: the strengths and limitations of formal evaluation and the uses which properly can be made of the evaluation. It also deals with such items as confidentiality, accountability, good manners, and good taste in preparing and using an evaluation report.

PART II. INTRODUCTION: WHY EVALUATION?

Rationale for Administrator Evaluation

In the last half century the rather fantastic growth of American business, governmental, and educational institutions has caused the scholars of the universities to begin to study these institutions in a systematic way. Organizations are being studied in terms of such aspects as productivity, efficiency, social utility, worthiness, and accountability. Attention is being given to their operations and their management, and a science of organizations and a science of management are emerging as a field of study in colleges and universities. A culmination of these types of activities is the evaluation of the varieties of organizations and their managers.

Colleges and universities have not been spared the scrutiny being given to other organizations. The larger society has come to realize, particularly in the last quarter of a century, that colleges and universities are exceedingly important to the nation's well-being and that they are expensive. As organizations they are pervasive, numbering nearly three thousand, and are found in almost every community of any size. They are enrolling more than ten million students annually, employing perhaps 750,000 faculty, and at least that many non-faculty. They educate practically all the nation's physicians; dentists; lawyers; teachers; engineers; accountants; journalists; nurses; pharmacists; architects; social workers; scientists; public administrators; armed services officers; and members of the judicial, executive, and legislative branches of state and national governments, as well as many other of the citizenry who have less specific occupational titles in terms of the skills and values necessary to practice their professions. Likewise, colleges and universities are the chief knowledge producers of the nation, doing basic research and making applications of knowledge to matters of agriculture and industrial production, health and public welfare, our legal and judicial systems, our systems of education and government, the defense of the nation—indeed to all activity relevant to the nation's general welfare. They cost approximately 35 billion dollars annually to operate. A few universities and systems of universities operate with budgets approaching a billion dollars per annum. They are exceedingly complicated institutions, perhaps the most complex that exist save for the military and the government. *And they must be managed.*

Managers must be employed. Logic would dictate that after employment, managers should be evaluated. Of course, they are, but largely informally. However, as organizations and their management are being studied systematically more and more, the informal processes of employment and evaluation are becoming formalized. Again, it is so with colleges and universities. As they operate in the public interest, and as they increasingly become dependent upon public funds from a variety of sources, those who can rightly ask that colleges and universities be accountable are doing so. *These officials, largely governmental, but also those who are trustees, are indirectly or directly asking for formal appraisals of college and university administrators or managers.*

Colleges and universities are also members of a limited class of institutions whose work force has a high proportion of professionals who claim and receive considerations and privileges not normally extended to organizational employees. Others of this limited class are hospitals and medical centers, law firms, and research organizations. In colleges and universities the chief work force is the faculty. Faculties play a significant role in policy formation and policy administration in higher education. They are interactive with administrators in a special way, and they demand of college and university administrators a consideration and an accountability significantly different from that required by employees or managers in most production and service organizations. *Faculties are asking for more formal appraisal of college and university administrators.*

Finally, students in colleges and universities have a status related to the organization that appears to be unique. They cannot be viewed as customers or consumers, as clients or patients, as wards or workers. Students, presumed to be a unique class, have on the one hand a special obligation to the colleges and universities that have admitted them even though in a sense, they are locked into the system; on the other hand, they expect certain considerations from the college or university as a matter of right as persons and as students. Hence, *students also ask that college and university administrations be accountable and that they be subjected to formal evaluation as administrators.*

Scope of the Monograph

This monograph is prepared so that colleges and universities can systematically and formally assess and evaluate the activities of college and university academic administrators as administrators. It is restrictive in that it deals only with academic administration. Academic administration is *leadership and managerial activity associated with teaching, research, educational services such as counseling or placement, and extension activities including con-*

tinuing education. This monograph is not directed to the college and university managerial class that assists in maintaining the organization but which has only casual association with faculty and students.

Government officials who deal with universities and boards of trustees rightly view the college or university president as the most significant, most responsible, and most influential of academic administrators. It is proper for officers of government and boards of trustees to direct their attention to presidents as a first consideration for formal assessment and evaluation. However, the entire academic administrative staff can be viewed as a system through which academic activity is carried out: recruitment, selection, and evaluation of students; organization and conduct of programs of instruction; organization and conduct of research programs; recruitment and evaluation of teaching and research personnel; supervision of student life and associated activities and integration of these with the more formal instructional programs; and so on. Persons who operate in these spheres bear such titles as provost, executive vice president, vice president for educational or academic affairs, vice president for research, vice president for student personnel services, dean of administration, dean of the faculties, dean of specific colleges and schools, and associates of these officers, e.g., associate or assistant deans.¹

It is obvious that these academic administrators through their activities have important and often decisive effects on crucial segments of an institution's operations. For example, deans of professional colleges are in the front rank of recruitment and selection of the college's faculty, in formulating and supervising instruction and evaluation processes, in maintaining the currency of the college's program, and in maintaining an atmosphere of professionalism in the school's instruction, research, and service activities.

This monograph does not direct itself explicitly to departmental chairpersons as academic administrators subject to evaluation under the assumptions and processes herein described. Currently, their status is ambiguous, as witnessed by the conflicting decisions of state labor relations boards and the National Labor Relations Board as to whether departmental chairpersons are faculty or administrators for collective negotiation purposes. How-

¹It perhaps will be essential for each college or university that uses this monograph as a guide to administrator evaluation to define the classes or categories of institutional personnel that will be evaluated in a given situation or point in time. In this monograph it is assumed that departmental chairpersons will not be evaluated, nor will those persons who supervise or have relationships to non-academic employees only (e.g., maintenance works). Troublesome positions that the institution will have to think through are represented by these titles: director of athletics, director of the university press, comptroller, and director of housing and food services.

ever, with some modification, this monograph could also be adapted to evaluate departmental chairpersons if such were desired.²

Despite as much as perhaps fifty years of history of systematic study of educational evaluation, rigorous processes of high validity and reliability have not been achieved except in limited areas. Informal processes are still the modal activity for teachers and administrators at the elementary and secondary school level or in postsecondary institutions. While seemingly scientific approaches have been given serious attention and rating scales of a considerable abundance have been created, hypotheses relating missions, objectives, organizations, or programs to activities and their direction, and all of these to competencies, performances, skills, attitudes or values presumed to result, are tentative and ambiguous. Likewise, hypotheses relating to measurement of outcomes and the measurement of growth or change in outcomes to a variety of variables are also tentative and ambiguous. Finally, attempts to quantify evaluations are still in a preliminary state of development. All this is a warning to those who would create a formal system of evaluation or would use it. Nonetheless, it is not amiss to strive to improve informal evaluations by formalizing concepts and procedures. That is what this monograph attempts.

Because the monograph is designed to be suggestive rather than definitive, the user should not hesitate to selectively adapt the model to a local situation or in terms of modifying certain assumptions relating to models and value considerations that governed the preparation of this monograph and the presentation of the model.

Types of Evaluation

Evaluation involves value judgments. These judgments are often made in relationship to norms or standards. Phrases such as "better than," "as good as," or "worse than" imply a judgment made in relation to a norm. These judgments may be qualitative as just illustrated. They may be quantified as, for example, in the use of an intelligence quotient or a percentile rank when a comparison is made of an individual against normative performance. Such judgments can be made for organizations, e.g., "College A has a student to faculty ratio of 8:1, which gives it the lowest ratio of 'N number' of specified colleges."

Comparisons may be made against a previous state or a previous performance, e.g., "College B has increased its endowment from M dollars per full-time equivalent student to

²Such modification might be, for example, designation of the dean of a college rather than the president to make the definitive and final evaluation of departmental persons. Such evaluation might also acknowledge the seemingly dual, if not paradoxical, role of departmental chairpersons as faculty and as managers.

Y dollars per full-time equivalent student. This is an increase of N percent." For an individual we may make such an evaluation as: "Student A increased his/her reading achievement score by Y grades in a period of N months." A college may report that its admissions applications increased from M thousands to Y thousands between two given years.

A third type of evaluation is simply a judgment rendered with available data at hand and in "professional terms," i.e., in terms of the judgment of a trained and experienced person or persons. The situation in which this kind of evaluation occurs usually has several characteristics. The criteria used in the evaluation are normally multiple and complex. The person or organization being evaluated is responding to a situation that is in many respects unique—the evaluation is made in terms of a specific situation, under a specific set of circumstances, and at a specific point in time. Such is the character of evaluations that are involved in accreditation of colleges and universities either as a whole (regional) or in terms of specific programs, e.g., a specific school such as medicine or a program in journalism.

The Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee: A Model

The model presented in this monograph results in a judgment bound to a particular situation in time and place. It also is a modification of the search committee now frequently used in colleges and universities to seek out and recommend for appointment both faculty and administrators. This model involves an *ad hoc evaluation committee*.³ The following aspects are involved: (1) as a first step, a self-analysis or self-evaluation is made by the administrator being evaluated; (2) descriptions and judgments are made by peers and other associates regarding the administrator (peers and associates are broadly viewed as other members or constituencies of the organization, i.e., trustees, other administrators, faculty, and students); and (3) a definitive value judgment regarding the individual is made after reviewing materials produced in aspects 1 and 2 by a group with the authority and information to do so. In our model, a summary value judgment is rendered by the *ad hoc evaluation committee* upon review of the administrator's self-evaluation and peer descriptions, which are compiled into an assessment portfolio. A definitive judgment is made by the board of trustees for presidents and by the president for other administrators.

³To our knowledge, the type of evaluation described in the monograph is utilized at present only by the *State University of New York* system in the evaluation of presidents.

Assumptions Basic to Academic Administrator Evaluation

A basic assumption in this monograph is that the formal process of evaluation must meet pragmatic tests of "seeming to be more valid and more reliable" than informal processes. It cannot be assumed that formal evaluations are necessarily so. The formal evaluation must be viewed by institutional constituencies as having been fair, objective, considerate, and in harmony with the conventional wisdom of those who should have a general understanding of the situational aspects of the evaluation.

A second assumption is that the person evaluated should have opportunity to review the process and conclusions of the evaluation with the person or group that makes the semi-final and final definitive judgments concerning the evaluation. There should be opportunity to appeal for a further consideration or review of definitive decisions after they are made known to the one evaluated, but under conditions set down in this monograph or otherwise agreed to.

A third assumption is that the nature of the review process generally shall be known, but that its results concerning any given individual are to remain confidential. The only exception to this practice shall be in those cases where unanimous agreement to waive the observance of confidentiality is reached by all parties involved in the process.

PART III. A PROCESS FOR FORMAL EVALUATION

Who Evaluates and Why

Evaluation is a process of review to assess the performance of academic administrators and to make a value judgment concerning this assessment. It is a formal process different from the informal activity continuously engaged in by many in universities and colleges and by almost all persons who have any interest in a given institution. In a formal system, it is to be assumed that authority to make a formal evaluation and to make definitive decisions based on the formal evaluation rests with the same authority (*de facto* rather than *de jure*) responsible for the appointment of a given administrator.

Legally and technically this authority lies with the governing board of any given college or university. Normally, however, the evaluation of the chief administrator of an organization—in this discussion a college or university president—is carried out directly under the authority and control of the board, while evaluation of academic administrators other than the president is delegated to the president. When this is so, the responsibility for definitive decisions concerning academic administrators rests with the college or university president. It is to be assumed that input, advice, counsel, and such will be given by a variety of “others” in colleges and universities regarding both presidential and other academic administrator evaluations. This is the meaning of the *ad hoc committee*, the character of which will be discussed at length later.

Uses of the Evaluation

The final and definitive use to which an official and formal evaluation points is continuance in office, removal from office, or advice and counsel concerning future services and tenure. But it is to be assumed that normal and systematic evaluations at regular or otherwise specified times will not generally be harshly concerned with a definitive decision to remove from office. Indeed, it seems that the removal of a president is characteristically related to an idiosyncratic situation such as unanticipated and climactic “occurrences” often following a breach of trust, a serious legal offense, insubordination, or a blatant failure of integrity.

It is assumed, then, that evaluations made periodically and of the character presented in this monograph will fall into place as part of the continuing activity to improve institu-

tional processes and decision making. The evaluation should be expected to serve the person being evaluated and to serve the college or university without being unduly threatening to either. Specifically, the evaluation should lead the evaluated administrator to a better understanding of the perceptions of those with whom he/she works. It should be an exercise in the Socratic dictum of "know thyself," presumably leading to greater effectiveness in the days and years ahead.

The evaluation should be of use to governing boards and in some respects to the institutional constituencies. The board will better understand the college or university president and other administrators. The board should also better understand the situation, with its demands and constraints, in which the president works. These understandings of other administrators in the institution should also be enhanced for the board and for the president.

Finally, as they understand that administrators are being evaluated, all constituencies should have increased confidence in the well-being of the college or university—to put the situation in homely language, the trustees and president will be perceived as truly tending the store.

The quality and uses of administrator evaluation will represent a range. This range will relate to such variables as the quality of the evaluators and their conscientiousness, whether or not the constituencies see the evaluations being taken seriously, reasonable maintenance of confidentiality and integrity by those involved in the process, and indicators of institutional change as a result of evaluation. Without integrity of purpose and process in the evaluations, they will be of little use; in some instances they can be dangerous.

In the end, an evaluation is an accountability document and should be so viewed. It should be looked upon as part of the system by which a college or university maintains itself. Evaluation is a proper activity in any organization. Colleges and universities are important institutions in Western culture. They exist as fundamental constructs within that culture. While autonomy is an important characteristic enjoyed by colleges and universities, essential if they are to fulfill their mission completely and with high effectiveness, they dare not claim that they are not accountable. Evaluation, then, should simply represent an aspect of accountability. It should be a part of the conscience of a college or university; it should be an instrument of institutional responsibility and maintenance; and it should be viewed as normal activity, in no sense coercive or policing in its normal dynamics.

Need for a Formal Evaluation System

It should be noted again that every college and university will reveal an informal evaluation system at work. Presidents, vice presidents, and deans will be continuously subject

to conversations by their peers, the faculty, and the students. As officers of the university, their work will be noted daily; they will be praised or blamed in faculty or academic senate meetings and in meetings of student governments, in the public press and in the student press. Such activity is the sign of an open institution and is normal organizational behavior, in no way pathological. Administrators who are astute will have ways of knowing what "people are saying" about them. They will again, if they are astute, know how to handle—i.e., evaluate—the messages they are receiving through the informal system. They will make their accommodations which will vary from circumstance to circumstance. There is much to be said that is favorable to an informal system. It creates campus folk heroes and campus devils as well. It is part of the campus value creating and value maintenance system. It does not demand a response system. It permits much to go on by way of both communication and adaptation that is essential without the need of bureaucratic intrusions. It is a system of ancient lineage and of powerful social value and consequence.

But it also has its limitations. As colleges and universities become institutions serving thousands and employing thousands, spending millions and performing duties essential to the maintenance of the national economy, the informal system is often proving insufficient. A system as extensive and pervasive as higher education requires extensive and pervasive bureaucracies for it to operate effectively. It is now apparent as a result of a general consensus that colleges and universities will be required to be formally responsive in assessments of its operations. Fiscal operations are routinely assessed by auditors, some institutionally selected and others representative of state and federal governments. The federal government and other official bodies are now routinely reviewing employment practices of colleges and universities, and particularly in relation to employment of and salaries paid to women and minority groups. Such assessments more and more often will include formal assessments of administrative personnel.

Caveats Regarding the Formal System

It is appropriate, then, to review briefly some expectations and some caveats as colleges and universities incorporate into their normal processes of operation a formal system of administrator evaluation. These include the following.

1. The formal system will complement an informal evaluation system. It will not—it cannot—replace the normal day-to-day judgments, praise, scoldings, and questioning that administrators experience. The formal system should add to the informal system, stabilize the total process, and, as is sometimes necessary, bring about

judgments that require official notice and action. A formal system should enhance the responsible management of colleges and universities.

2. While the strengths of a formal system can be noted, the limitations should be recognized. An evaluation cannot be made ad hoc, in response to day-to-day variations, inconsistencies, or less than 100 percent efficiencies that characterize all administration. Even in the name of accountability or of democratic governance, institutions cannot be responding to the whims of the disgruntled; the vagaries of shifting styles and values; or the variety of claims and counter claims made by religious, civic, social, or patriotic groups that require administrative attention. Colleges and universities inherently have great stability. They represent enduring and conserving values. Their administrations and their trustees should represent these values. Evaluation should be a stabilizing process, not a disrupting one.
3. All constituencies, particularly the faculty, trustees, alumni, and supporting agencies of government, need to have clear understanding of the process and potential of administrator evaluation. Without such understanding, unattainable expectations will often be expressed or the process may be deemed a boondoggle, a whitewash, a "con or snow job."
4. All who participate in evaluation need to have an enlightened sense of responsibility. Such persons generally will be deemed persons of wisdom and judgment, sensitive to human feelings, and persons of conscience. These qualities are required of evaluators.
5. While it will be known that processes of administrator evaluation exist and their natures should be understood, confidentiality dare not be abridged. Although Woodrow Wilson once called for "open covenants openly arrived at," diplomacy cannot operate with full and complete openness. It might seem desirable in light of current trends—sunshine laws, for example—not to make evaluation confidential, or, because of privacy laws, to make it highly constricted. Both of these alternatives, however, would be detrimental to the long-range health of a college or university. Authority must be delegated and accepted with full faith and trust if administrator evaluation is to succeed. General findings will be known, but intimacies should not be fully shared.

The Frame of Reference for Evaluation

Specific in Time and Place. Evaluation must be conducted in terms of a specific frame of reference. The evaluation should be specific in time and place as well as in the role of the one evaluated. For example, it was one thing to be president of an expanding university with the flow of resources available in what we now call the golden sixties. It is another, however, to be president even of the same university in the relatively austere seventies. As another example, the tenure of several presidents of universities of great quality might have been years longer than it was had it not been for the student aggressions, including violence and destruction of property, as the sixties became the seventies. On the other hand, some persons came to power as presidents because of the way they performed in the face of violence.

The constraints of time and space must be considered with care because the situational character of an institution may at one time be critical while at another time a president may create the situation that makes him successful. The ambiguity of "situation versus the power of the person" is evident as one considers the contrast of these familiar quotations:

The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, But in ourselves . . . William Shakespeare
The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong . . . Ecclesiastes

In any event, when making a judgment concerning an administrator, the freedom and the constraints the situation presents must be at least implicitly reviewed. When Kauffman states that the presidential search "should be related to the institution's own, often unique, circumstances, problems and opportunities," we must then implicitly infer that the tenure and satisfaction of and with the president will also rest on the "institution's own circumstances."

Expectations of the Administrator and Institution at Time of Appointment. During the evaluation process, the evaluators must learn what the employer and the employed, e.g., the trustees and the president, deemed the college or university mission to be at the time of appointment. It should be determined if mission and role were mutually understood or were ambiguous.¹ This is a necessary condition in evaluating whether or not the administrator has

¹Guidelines for conditions of employment for college and university professors have recently been issued by The American Association of State Colleges and Universities. This report states: "It is important that the conditions under which college and university presidents serve be known and understood particularly by the presidents and governing boards." (Italics ours.) The report goes on to say that such is particularly important when we "recognize the new phenomenon of systematic evaluation of presidential leadership." The report continues, saying: "Few presidents of colleges and universities serve with a clearly stated contractual agreement." The point is that the conditions of service and the contractual agreement become a baseline for presidential evaluation. As a college, university, or a system for higher education begins to

total responsibility for the organization. Unfortunately, the situation is too often ambiguous or one party or the other has misunderstood. This type of situation has to be handled in the evaluation.

It may be desirable at the time of evaluation of a president for a statement to be prepared about the realities of the institution both over time and at a given time. Such a statement might well include a discussion of the historical roots of the institution, its character (e.g., public-private, sectarian-nonsectarian), its service area, its resource base, and so on. The same type of statement would probably be desirable for a subunit (e.g., a college of medicine), if the dean of such college were being evaluated.

Such a statement may be prepared by or for the *ad hoc committee on evaluation* and be reviewed by the president, or the president may incorporate such a statement into his/her self-evaluation. A similar type of statement only modestly modified should be part of the record for other administrator evaluations. The preparation of such a statement can be arranged by the president. Such a statement may illuminate a situation of this type: Faculty and/or students may be critical of a president's first years of tenure for not "staying home" but "spending too much time" in the state capital or in Washington. Yet, faculty or students may find during the course of the evaluation that the board of trustees had explicitly directed the president to establish such relations as his/her highest priority.

Specific Issues at Time Administrator Hired. Such a statement of mission and role requirements may be complemented by one stating specific issues or situations that existed as an administrator "came on board" and to which he/she was charged to give explicit attention. Such items as the following may be illustrative: eliminate budget deficits, reorganize

formalize evaluation, the institution or system should provide for such a baseline. For example, in Pennsylvania, the appointment of the president of a state college or university is a governor's appointment. The appointment is initiated by the local board of trustees; however, state boards, the commissioner for higher education, and the secretary of education have role responsibilities before the official appointment is made. Because of the complex interactions that lead to a president's appointment in Pennsylvania's state-owned colleges, it would seem best to formalize the processes of appointment and to draw up a contract specifying the conditions of appointment (expectations concerning service in office being a significant part). For an incumbent who has been evaluated, conditions for continuation in office should also be formalized and made a matter of record.

It also seems appropriate to make this observation: Removal of a president from office in the State Colleges and University system has been ruled to be a prerogative of the governor without consultation, specifically, without consultation with the college's board of trustees. Hence, it would seem that a decisive evaluation, specifically when it involves dismissal, can only become operational by an act of the governor. However, evaluation has a much broader reference than a result of retention or dismissal. While it should be clear to whom a president is accountable, the formal evaluation should be effective in influencing a variety of interactions by a president with his staff, his board, and state bodies. If formal evaluation of presidents and other academic administrators is to be involved, and if removal is a potential consequence, a system of employment security for academic administrators, equivalent to tenure for faculty and civil service status for other administrators should be established.

the governance of athletic activity, upgrade the faculty or student body, establish better legislative relations, cultivate potential donors, or greatly expand library holdings.

Finally, as a preview to evaluation, it should become clear to the ad hoc committee who the primary and secondary constituencies are that an administrator needs to relate to. These will shift as the committee thinks first of the president, then his/her vice presidents, e.g., academic affairs, fiscal affairs, student activities, or planning and public relations, then to deans of disciplinary schools and of professional schools. These constituencies help define the freedoms and constraints under which administrators operate.

Locus of Authority for Evaluations

The authority to conduct administrator evaluations needs to be clear to all concerned. When a board of trustees holds all the corporate power of a college or university, it has final authority for administrator evaluation. However, authority may be delegated. In this monograph, it is proposed that just as the board of trustees holds final and specific authority for the appointment of presidents, it assumes that authority for presidential evaluation.

For administrators other than the president, it is proposed that final authority for evaluations be held by the president. He/she may inform the board of trustees of his/her authoritative evaluations, but the president should accept responsibility for them and should also make the decision about how the evaluation is to be used.

Confusion may arise with public higher education systems where there is ambiguity about appointment and retention. In some systems, a president is appointed by a superior board only as a local board recommends it. (See footnote, page 14.) It may not, however, hold that the president can be removed only as a local board may recommend removal.²

It is the recommendation of this monograph that local boards accept full responsibility for cyclical evaluations of presidents. The responsibility would include establishing the frequency of administrator evaluations, as well as making the evaluation policy known to those who will be evaluated and to the university community and other interested observers. It is further recommended that final evaluation decisions for presidents when conducted in Pennsylvania be transmitted by the local boards to the State College and University Directors with a notice sent to the Secretary of Education.

²The locus of authority for appointment and dismissal in terms *de jure* and *de facto* in the public colleges and universities of the fifty states will be diverse. This monograph couches the responsibility for appointment and evaluation as being in the hands of a board of trustees and assumes appointing and dismissal power to be correlated. However, as use is made of this monograph as a model and manual for presidential and other academic administrative evaluation, the authority for making and using such evaluations must be explicitly determined and stated. Such an explicit statement regarding Pennsylvania's State Colleges and University is made in a footnote on p. 13.

The evaluation of vice presidents, deans, provosts, directors, and others with comparable titles should be the responsibility of the president or of a college or university officer delegated to accept the responsibility. However, final and definitive judgment regarding the evaluation should be the president's.

Earlier in the monograph, it was recommended that the search committee model be used in the evaluation process and that it be designated as an *ad hoc evaluation committee*. The ad hoc evaluation committee can take several forms. While an evaluation committee and a search committee have somewhat different tasks, in either instance there is an "evaluation" of a "person" in relationship to a specific "task." A search committee evaluates a person in order to make a prediction—that is, to predict to what degree the evaluated person will in *future time* perform a set of tasks in a fully satisfactory manner. An evaluation committee assesses a given person in terms of performing a given set of tasks and makes a value judgment about how well the person performed in *time past*. Where colleges and universities have standardized the composition and procedures of search committees, they may become the model for evaluation committees, with any clearly recognized modifications that seem desirable. The following model is offered as one workable for evaluating presidents.

Composition of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee. The ad hoc committee for the evaluation of presidents should have a membership of no less than eight, consisting of the following:

1. Two members of the board of trustees to be selected by the board.
2. Two members of the senior administrative staff (deans, provosts, or vice presidents) selected by the board of trustees from a list of four provided by the president. The members shall be considered peer members.³
3. Two persons selected from the tenured faculty by the generally recognized faculty organization and by methods of the organization's own choosing. If the college or university has an academic senate, this body may be designated. If there is no senate but there is a faculty union organization, this body may make the selection.
4. There shall be one student selected by the recognized student governance association by methods of its own choosing.

³Some presidents may protest that other senior administrators are not their peers. It is the author's position that the perceptions of presidential role, performance, character, and constraints held by vice presidents and deans are often as valid as those of the president himself/herself and may thus be considered the president's peers.

5. There shall be one alumnus or alumna selected by the alumni/alumnae association by methods of its own choosing if such an association exists. If such an association does not exist, the board of trustees shall make the selection.

The board of trustees should, on its own authority, modify the above model by adding members to achieve ethnic, racial, or sexual balance or to provide for other constituencies that the board believes should be represented.

The chairperson of the ad hoc committee may be a trustee named by the board, or the board may ask the ad hoc committee to choose its own chairperson. It is suggested that the ad hoc evaluation committee membership be modified for all evaluations of academic administrators other than the president as follows: The president should appoint three persons from the administrator peer group and name one of these three persons as chairperson. The faculty should be asked to name three persons to the committee. One student and one alumnus/alumna should be named as stated above. The effect is that the board of trustees will not be represented on the ad hoc committee, although the board will receive the evaluation of the committee and of the president with such recommendations as the president wishes to make.

Again, the board may desire to modify the above model and should do so to achieve balance or otherwise to secure a committee that would seem to be most appropriate for a given evaluation. This modification may involve naming one or more trustees to the committee.

Responsibilities of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee. The specific task of the ad hoc evaluation committee is to prepare an *assessment portfolio* for a specific person being evaluated. Each evaluation will require an ad hoc committee selected to evaluate a particular administrator. (The nature of the assessment portfolio is discussed on page 21 of this monograph.)

The following procedure should be followed:

1. The "assessment portfolio" will be delivered to the president for all evaluations except that of the president. It is assumed that each person evaluated is directly responsible to the president, e.g., vice presidents, deans, directors. Those evaluations of persons not so responsible will be handled as exceptions. The president's portfolio will go to the board of trustees.
2. The president will review each portfolio other than his/her own and prepare an evaluation. In some circumstances he/she may delegate this responsibility, but the

final responsibility for the evaluation resides in the president. He/she will review the evaluation with the person being evaluated. He/she will transmit to the board of trustees his/her evaluation for its information. He/she will retain the appraisal portfolio in the college or university personnel file.

3. The board of trustees will review the president's portfolio, make an evaluation, and review it with the president.
4. After the board of trustees' review with the president, the profile with its evaluation should be forwarded to the chairperson of the State College and University Directors with a copy to the Secretary of Education.

Role of Ad Hoc Committee Members. Each of the members of the ad hoc committee, as noted, will represent a constituency or other representative interests. It has to be recognized that each member is able to speak only from a limited perspective and then in representative terms, i.e., students can hardly speak as representative of the faculty or the faculty as representative of the administrative hierarchy. *However*, each of the members of the ad hoc committee must assume personal responsibility for statements he/she makes. Each must know that he/she can in no way express the diversities of perceptions of judgments that a given group will always contain. To maintain a responsible role in what, at best, can be perceived as a paradoxical situation requires wisdom, courage, and tact from each person on the committee. Each group of two or three represented on the ad hoc committee will prepare its own statement. Each will attempt to convey what it believes the consensus or the variety of points of view of its constituency to be, *but* it will be discreet in seeking this consensus or these points of view. It will not poll or survey its membership or seek interviews with a random sample. Finally, each will make a statement that it believes to be a fair representation and will make known its own point of view.

Roles of Each Constituent Group. We will now attempt to clarify in a preliminary way the perspectives the representative groups bring to the evaluation and indicate what each should or might contribute to the assessment portfolio.⁴

Trustees: The trustees have a special responsibility in the evaluation of the presidents. As members of the ad hoc committee, they will have the responsibility to bring to the entire committee membership understandings between the president and the board at the time of initial appointment and subsequent to it. For example, the board may have stated to the

⁴An even more complete delineation of roles and responsibilities of committee members will be discussed in Part V.

president that external relations (with the community, alumni/alumnae, and with governmental bodies) should have high priority in his/her performance in a variety of roles. This perspective may be unknown to other constituencies. Other general and special situations that the board has agreed to or considered with the president should be known. The board members should make their evaluations in terms of board interests, perspectives, and concerns.

Peer Members: The peer members of an ad hoc committee bring different perspectives. They see their fellow administrators in action more frequently than any other group. They know the freedom and constraints imposed by the board, by the environment, by significant others. They can see more of the "warts," but they can also empathize more than others. They may well be comrades, displaying a fellowship of peers. They should not attempt to escape from these interactions as they make their evaluations, but consider these close interactions as opportunities to "know better than others" what a given academic administrator is doing and how well or how ill he is doing it.

Faculty: Faculty members carry the value system of the college or university; i.e., they are the institution in terms of performance, values, interactions, meaning, significance, and, in the end, they satisfy that crass word, productivity. While faculty can on occasion be insensitive, even cruel, they must tell it as they perceive it regarding academic administrators. If an administration or administrator is brilliant, let the faculty say so; if shabby, let them report it in the same fashion. They should be guided by their professionalism, and by their professional or disciplinary perspectives and commitments. They should be forthright, open, and, if necessary, courageous in making their evaluations.

Students: The students, more than the other groups represented, are in many respects unique. They are here today and gone tomorrow. They have little sense of history and are often indifferent to college or university tasks other than those of the faculty serving the students as instructors. Yet students are everywhere about the institution; they expect it to command and deserve their loyalties now and after graduation. The college or university will be to them, alma mater. While their evaluations inevitably will be limited by their own limitations, the perspectives they will bring to the assessment portfolio will be significant and useful.

The Alumni: The alumni/alumnae, as former students, perhaps have a greater sensitivity to human fallibility than current students. Their judgments will probably be more tempered by the passage of time and the perspectives brought on by added experience, maturing,

and aging. Their contribution to the evaluation will be complementary to that of students and useful in what will normally be its tempering effects.

Responsibilities of Boards of Trustees and Presidents

As indicated above, the board of trustees will receive the portfolio and evaluation of the president. The president will receive the evaluation and portfolio of other academic administrators. Each should acknowledge receipt of the evaluation and then dismiss the committee with thanks. Their work is over. There is one exception: after studying the evaluation, the board or the president may wish to meet with the ad hoc committee for clarification or for a more analytical discussion of the assessment portfolio and the summary evaluation. This meeting together should not be deemed irregular.

After receiving the evaluations and entering into a discussion or clarification with the committee, as is deemed desirable, the trustees or the president, as the case may be, should prepare a *final* and *definitive* evaluation. This evaluation should not be lengthy; but it should reveal strengths and limitations, make an overall estimate of administrative performance, and, if suitable, make suggestions such as a shift in style, better utilization of time, or other suggestions for change.

The trustees should review with the president the substance of the assessment portfolio, the committee's evaluation, and the board's definitive evaluation. In some instances, this discussion will be proforma—even congratulatory. In others, it can be prolonged, in depth, even severe and traumatic. The governing principles should be respect for human dignity and the welfare of the college and university.

The president should conduct a similar review with each of his/her evaluated academic administrators. It should represent the same processes and concerns just discussed.

As noted before, the board will send a report of the presidential evaluation to the chairperson of the State Colleges and University Board of Directors with a copy to the Secretary of Education. This report will normally be a statement of the conditions and nature of the evaluation, the substance of the portfolio (but not the portfolio itself), the committee's evaluation, and the definitive evaluation. There should be a letter of transmittal. The president will send a copy of his/her evaluation of evaluated academic administrators to the members of the board of trustees. This report will probably not be as inclusive as the report made by the trustees to the State Colleges and University Board. Such reports should be viewed as a part of the activities of the president in being accountable for his/her custodial role as president.

The Assessment Portfolio

The assessment portfolio begins with the president's—or other administrator's—self-evaluation, which may be accompanied by a statement concerning the development and current status of the institution or appropriate subunit. The assessment portfolio then incorporates statements of the groups represented on the ad hoc committee. Finally, the portfolio should contain a statement that is a summing up and represents the committee's consensual judgment concerning the administrator being evaluated. Dissenting or minority statements should be included if requested by a dissenter or a minority. The assessment is descriptive, analytic and evaluative, or judgmental. However, it does not represent a final or definitive evaluation. As noted earlier, this definitive evaluation is to be made by the board for presidential evaluations and by the president for all others, except where the president makes an exception.

The assessment portfolio need have no standard format. Criteria to assist evaluators in making their statements will be presented in Part IV. Some evaluators will prefer to use checklists and similar forms. They will seek objectivity. Others may write extended analytical essays and will not fear to be personal, qualitative, or even sentimental. All evaluators should remember that their observations will be but part of a whole and will be tempered, strengthened, or even negated by evaluations of others. Truth and reality have many dimensions and the evaluation inevitably should be multidimensional. The total evaluation will be value-oriented and judgmental. It should also be descriptive and have face validity, i.e., it should in large measure articulate what is generally not articulated but generally known. It should reflect an attitude of fairness, responsibility, and concern. It should not be prepared in haste or out of personal rancor or out of the narrow issues or problems of the day. It should be worthy in terms of the individual being judged and of the bodies making the judgments.

Due Process in Administrative Evaluations

The evaluation of administrators is an act of accountability in harmony with current trends. Due process is another and complementary act of accountability. As a board of trustees and a president commit themselves to evaluation, it is essential that those who will be affected know the process. This monograph provides a process. If a board or president

uses it as it is, all should be able to know and understand the process. As the process presented in this monograph is modified by a board or president, the nature of the modifications should be made known.

However, a part of the process, the right of review or the use of an appeals process, has not yet been discussed. It has been assumed and stated that with presidential review, there will be an interaction between the president and the board at which the character and findings of the review will be discussed. This discussion itself can be used as a review mechanism if the president asks for it and the board agrees. Should there be no meeting of minds by the president and board, it is suggested that the president have the right of appeal to either the State College and University Board of Directors or to the Secretary of Education. In any instance, each (SCUD and the Secretary) should formulate and agree upon a procedure by which appeals can be made or filed and appropriately handled. This procedure should become public knowledge.

Other academic administrators should have the right to ask for a review or to file an appeal regarding an evaluation. Again it is assumed that in each instance of evaluation, there will have been an interaction between the person evaluated and the president at which the process and findings of the evaluation were discussed. Should the discussion or findings prove unsatisfactory to the one evaluated, he/she should have the opportunity to ask for a further review or to file an appeal. It is suggested that the president and the board have a process for conducting a review or hearing an appeal and rendering a decision. If the institution does not have a process, the following is suggested as a model: The board shall name two of its members and the president shall name a peer administrator who shall constitute a *review and appeals board or committee* for academic administrators other than the president who have undergone evaluation. This board may hold such hearings or arrange interviews with such persons as it desires. It shall hear the person aggrieved who may offer to the board materials in writing and bring to the interview with the board counsel of his/her choice. The review board shall prepare a written finding and make copies available to the person aggrieved, the president, and the board of trustees.

The president and the board of trustees will make a final disposition of a review or appeal based on recommendations of a review or appeals board or committee and legal constraints.

PART IV – CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION: CONDITIONS AND CRITERIA

Up to this point, we have attempted to validate academic administrator review in terms of its uses. We have also outlined a process. We have defined the roles of constituent groups that may be represented on an *ad hoc evaluation committee*. We have not yet, however, discussed criteria that evaluators should or can be aware of—criteria that illuminate an area of administrative responsibility; that provide indicators of performance; that help to define, describe, or measure performance.

In this monograph, we do not propose to review theories of measurement or the means of establishing validity and reliability as critical elements of evaluation, although these are matters of fundamental importance. We do know enough to say that criteria signifying failure or success in administration are imperfectly expressed, are not amenable to universal agreement as to their utility, nor do they lend themselves to measurement and quantification on any of the ways that will win acceptance or generally please the many students of measurement and quantification of human characteristics or behavior.

On the other hand, those who work in or study the academic world do have a considerable experience; they have set forth many elements relevant to judgments of success or failure in administrative roles, and they have an empirical wisdom. It is in this sense of experience, of pragmatic considerations, of the wisdom and insight that wins the approval of those who are experienced and who have an intuitive sense of the rightness or wrongness of administrative acts, that we do move now to the discussion of criteria and the frame of reference out of which judgments can be made.

Let us first discuss elements of a frame of reference that will indicate the relevance of some criteria and irrelevance of others as they relate both to general and specific evaluations.

Complex Role and Environment of Presidential Functioning

The competencies that a president must demonstrate over time are multifaceted, overlapping, and often contradictory. For example, a given situation may require boldness of a president while another of no less significance and congruent in time with the first may call for extreme caution. To say that a president must on occasion be bold is a valid statement. To say that a president must on occasion be cautious is also valid. The consequence is that there is no way to identify a few qualities, characteristics, habit patterns, competencies, or

performances that will permit a valid evaluation. As one considers the role performance of academic administrators other than the president, there may be a narrowing or valid delimiting of essential or desirable attributes. It is, however, reasonable to suggest that all of academic administration requires a complex of talents or attributes.

Likewise, the situation in which an academic administrator operates is, in almost all instances, an environment of complexity rather than simplicity. Not only presidents but vice presidents, deans, and other administrators deal with numbers of human beings, perhaps hundreds and even thousands of persons and a variety of constituencies—fellow administrators; faculty representing a variety of disciplines and modes of thought and action; students who are bright, who are dull, and who are mediocre; alumni/alumnae who are much the same; bureaucrats within the institution who are essential to its maintenance but who have narrow perspectives or limited conceptions of their roles; and extrainstitutional constituencies such as governmental officials, members of professional associations, accreditation teams, state boards of education, other state agencies, state legislatures and governors, and federal officials who monitor higher education or make grants of money, and so on.

Finally, the college or university is an organization that, if it is not unique, is representative of a very small class that is not to be perceived, or judged, or managed in terms of conditions normally operating in the worlds of business and industry. We will make no attempt here to be definitive about the nature of colleges and universities as organizations, but we will be suggestive and thus hope to indicate the varieties of talents academic administrators seem to need.

Universities are among the most complex of all institutions, exceeded in complexity only by governments and military establishments. Business and industries may be larger but they are seldom as complex. Universities are teaching institutions but also research and service institutions. They form a system in which thousands of persons of relatively autonomous or independent status are massively interactive. They house and feed thousands of students daily; they minister to their health needs; they satisfy their recreational needs. They conduct sports activities that are mass entertainment. They purchase almost all purchasable items that one can name—e.g., scientific apparatus of every type, thousands of drugs for a school of pharmacy, and computers of the most sophisticated design. They maintain a police force. They park thousands of cars daily. They manage and control funds that are in the tens and hundreds of millions; in at least one institution, these funds exceed a billion dollars. As inventoried earlier, they educate practically all of the nation's *professional* work force—physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, attorneys, teachers, engineers, librarians, geneticists, chemists, psychologists, planners, architects, accountants, managers, journalists, statisticians,

horticulturists, artists, and musicians. This list is by no means complete or definitive. They not only educate these persons, they often *certify* their competency. And these exceedingly complex institutions must be managed.

Colleges and universities involve a work force of the most intelligent or talented and best educated of human beings. These persons, the faculties of the nation's colleges and universities, enjoy freedoms known to few others in our society, i.e., they are autonomous professionals. They claim and receive a considerable participation in the governance (management) of colleges and universities. No other organizations except a few professionally saturated and labor intensive organizations have such a complex management system in which the workers have a high degree of self-governance and policy control.

Finally, colleges and universities operate in the public interest in a very special way. They provide the nation talented human resources, they are the chief knowledge producers, and they are one of but a few institutions that serve as the nation's conscience and the nation's critic. In these terms, colleges and universities are accountable in ways that are faced by only a few other institutions with similar roles.

The organization *per se* of colleges and universities differs significantly in several ways from business and similar organizations. The heart of the college or university, the faculty, operating as teachers or researchers through schools or colleges is *not* a bureaucratic structure in normally defined terms. Hierarchical structures are minimal; individuals (members) have high autonomy; authority for many decisions made by faculties as individuals and groups is *final authority*; relationships of hierarchical authority—deans, vice presidents, and presidents—are such that "supervision" is minimal or nominal, and authority is frequently shared; the power of the faculty is considerable and is real; mechanisms for faculty through which they exercise authority, as in senates, are technically crude; and participation in the authority structures is fluid.

This statement should be enough to establish the uniqueness of the college or university administrative task. Among the descriptors that conventional wisdom applies to the academic administrator are: ability to deal with people; to communicate to them and earn their goodwill; economic responsibility in the use of institutional resources; political sophistication; considerable managerial skill; intelligence and presumed scholarly talents; ability to judge well the qualities of others; skill in establishing extramural relationships; good health and abundant energy; ability to write and speak; ability to mediate conflict; and ability to see ahead and plan for the future. The list could be extended almost without limits in terms of "good" qualities.

The morai of the discussion of the institutional complexity and of multiple administrative roles and competencies is that an evaluator of administrators needs to perceive the many facets that elicit judgments. Evaluation is not a simplistic exercise. It deals with multiple criteria and judgments that are qualitative and value laden.

Some Dicta and Caveats

Certain assumptions or presuppositions seem to be called for and accepted as given as we strive to produce an effective evaluation system. These items would seem to be relevant.

1. An appraisal system must never fail of dignity and confidentiality. While at times evaluations can lead to unpleasant consequences, those involved must have respect for the process and the persons involved. Embarrassment is to be avoided. The process should have no place for cynicism, punishment, or vindictiveness. The activity should be low-keyed. Supervision of the process must be carried out by persons of the highest integrity, by those who have earned the respect of others. Human feelings and sensibilities are involved, and all activity should be sensitive to these concerns.
2. The nature of the human condition—that all of us are flawed—should be understood by all. Perfection as an ideal may be entertained; but it is best for those involved in evaluation, particularly those who evaluate the evaluation and deal directly with the evaluated administrator, to understand human limitation—that all of us err, that understanding of potential human response is essential, and that all evaluation inherently involves criticism. It requires courage to deal with criticism, either as one who criticizes or as one who is criticized. Sensitivity is the order of the day in evaluation.
3. A person evaluated has a “right to know” how he/she was evaluated, criteria involved, and how he/she rated.
4. Evaluation involves so many variables and so many that are qualitative, subtle, and complex that an *evaluation* does not produce a simple document; a checklist of modest length; or a score, ratio, quotient, or other quantified, simplistic measure.
5. Perhaps the best conception of the outcome is that there will be an evaluation profile or, even better, an evaluation portfolio.
6. The profile or portfolio may be reduced by evaluators of the evaluation to a modest paragraph or page, but it should always be realized that this kind of reduction becomes a generalization or even an abstraction.

Further Caveats

Evaluations or assessments are multifaceted. The statements made below reveal this. In some areas, the securing of relevant data is not difficult; in other areas it is almost impossible. For example, we will note later that in the academic world production criteria are almost impossible to evaluate on a short-run schedule. All of the areas named below have some relevancy. The weightings to be given are often difficult. On occasion, "one flaw" may outweigh a preponderance of favorable evaluations. On other occasions, one great strength may more than compensate for unfavorable evaluations elsewhere.

Recognition of a second condition is fundamental. The same qualities or assessments may be nearly ideal in one time or place and quite inappropriate in another time or place. Valid evaluations can only be such as they are related to specific tasks at specific times, in a specific place.

We all have known persons with qualities to be an excellent "Number Two Person" in an organization but not "Number One." The reverse is true. Qualities that made a good dean may handicap a person as president; e.g., a person who *loves* to work in areas of curriculum and instruction can be quite unhappy, frustrated, even ineffective operating as a president. Qualities of aggressiveness, hard work, long hours, impatience, and high attention to detail may be "just right" in some spots and "most handicapping" in others.

While the statements just made may seem to be truisms, they are often overlooked in evaluating evaluations.

Criteria for Evaluation

Let us now record a list of criteria that would seem valid to use in judging academic administrators and that would seem to be relatively inclusive or complete. Following the listing, an interpretation of each will be made, its significance in the total evaluation process will be noted, and certain caveats in the use of the criteria will be stated. The classes of criteria are as follows:

1. Criteria related to education and training
2. Criteria related to experience
3. Criteria related to organizational production
4. Criteria related to organizational efficiency
5. Criteria related to performance as an academic leader
6. Criteria related to performance as an academic manager

7. Criteria related to personality, health, energy, personal values, and administrative style
8. Criteria of educational statesmanship
9. Criteria related to astuteness and sophistication in such affairs as are political, economic, social, and involving interactions with persons on and off campus
10. Criteria that would seem to be related to institutional uniqueness or special institutional attributes
11. Criteria, if satisfied, that counterbalance weaknesses elsewhere
12. Criteria that, if not satisfied, guarantee failure

Education and Experience. Criteria related to education or training and experience would seem more valid to a search process than to performance or current status as an administrator. After a person holds an academic administrative position, evaluators will give more attention to "on-the-job" displays of performance, character, and so on. Hence, these criteria will not have a significant place in the list of criteria against which academic administrative performance is judged.

Productivity and Efficiency. Criteria of productivity and efficiency would seem on first consideration to be extremely important. Evaluation of administrators in the business and industrial world, in the management of athletic teams, and in some other occupational groups give great weight to productivity and efficiency criteria. However, their use in judging academic administrators has grave limitations.

Colleges and universities and their academic administration can be evaluated at best in terms of productivity and efficiency only in elementary terms. Other criteria frequently take precedence—morale, spirit, creativity, loyalty, spectacular success in a single sphere of effort, deferred satisfactions not measured in terms of months or a few years, and so on.

Productivity in colleges and universities often can be only crudely quantified and quality is often not ascertainable except over extended periods of time, often as long as even 50 or more years. If one counts number of degrees, student credit hours generated, number of dropouts, journal articles or books published, or costs per student, much additional information is required before one knows whether or not the "countings" have any validity; in some respects, the validity may be nonexistent or highly ambiguous.

Likewise, evaluations of presumed efficiency standards are treacherous to interpret, even by the wisest of informed persons. Is a system with high admissions standards and low dropout rates presumed to be better in terms of efficiency standards than one with open ad-

missions and higher dropout rates? One does not dare to say "Yes" except as much, much more information is available, and then not always with certainty. Much more, of course, can be said as an interpretation of this idea.

Finally, relating such measures of productivity and efficiency of colleges and universities as organizations as may be valid to the *performance of academic administrators* of a given time is, at best, hazardous. The quality of a faculty recruited by a dean may not be clearly evident until some years after the initial acts. This is particularly true if the dean has been a bold, courageous, and risk-taking recruiter rather than a recruiter of a "safe" staff. Practices presumably developed and made operational in terms of efficiency may be discovered over time actually to be counterproductive. For example, Conant once wrote that the "search committee" idea for recruitment of faculty and administrators assured uniformly *good* appointments but seldom brilliant ones. Only time alone will reveal an aberration.

The consequences of the above statements as they have validity lead to the conclusion that evaluation of academic administrators must be designed in other terms than their presumed productivity or efficiency in the college or university. That is, there are few criteria available in colleges and universities comparable to those in the business and industrial world, e.g., sales made in units of time, items of a given quality processed in a given time, reduction in process time (efficiency) resulting from modernization, and so on.

Performance Criteria. Performance criteria are at the heart of academic administrator evaluation. Obviously, productivity and efficiency are important indicators of performance. But we have just said that these indicators are not particularly useful in academic evaluations. We must treat performance criteria in some other way. It is recommended in this monograph that performance criteria be satisfied by evaluation under three categories. They are: (1) performance that demonstrates or otherwise is indicative of leadership; (2) performance indicative of managerial skills; and (3) performance specifically related to work habits, interactions with others, and patterns of response in a variety of situations related to administrative demands.

Leadership. Criteria related to leadership produce a complex of interactions and activities. Leadership per se is activity of a particular kind and has as its essence preserving, maintaining, interpreting, and enhancing the worth of the college or university as an institu-

tion—that is, an organization infused with value.¹ An academic leader must interact with a broad spectrum of persons who have an “interest in” a specific college or university. They include faculties, other administrators, trustees, students and alumni, and persons in the community, the state, and the nation. Much of a president’s time is devoted to activities that either directly or indirectly seek to enhance the image or prestige of the college or university or to establish an environment in which the college or university can thrive. The evaluation process should bring forth the dimensions of the administrator’s activity related to his/her leadership role and also attach value judgments to the administrator’s activity.

Management. Criteria related to an administrator’s managerial role relate to an administrator’s skill in such areas as budget preparation and control; personnel management, involving such aspects as recruitment skill; judging the performance of others; negotiating faculty union contracts; being sensitive to organization forms and their consequences and reorganizing as it seems indicated; and sensitivity to the operations and use of resources by support systems, e.g., the library or building maintenance. The role of administrators, presidents, or others, as “managers” of students in all their interactions can be of utmost importance in judging the success or lack of success of administrators.

Personal Performance. A third dimension of performance relates to such matters as the following: How well does the administrator use his/her time? Is he/she prompt in his/her responses when demands are made? Is he/she visible or reclusive? Is the administrator competent in his/her communication activities? Can he/she manage conflict? Does the administrator comprehend the breadth of activities he/she is engaged in and the judgments that are being made of his/her performances in relation to a broad spectrum of constituencies?

Personal Qualities. Criteria of personality, personal values, presence, or administrative style, health, and energy are often critical in evaluations. The significance of these criteria is almost a given in evaluation; in fact, they often receive the bulk of attention of evaluations particularly at the executive level in business and industry as well as in education. In somewhat technical or conceptual terms, we are involved in evaluating the effects of the “socialization” that an academic administrator has received. In fact, we say about the administrator: “Does he/she look like an administrator? Does he/she talk like one? What are his/her values?”

¹Philip Selznick, *Leadership in Administration* (New York: 1957), pp. 62-64. The key leadership tasks as set forth by Selznick include the definition of institutional mission and rule, the institutional embodiment of purpose, the defense of institutional integrity, and the ordering of internal conflicts.

What does he/she stand for? Is his/her health good? Will he/she support academic freedom? Will this administrator respect faculty values? Does he/she have a high energy quotient and health that is not handicapping?"

Subsystems of criteria in this realm could also include the following: (1) integrity; (2) good will; (3) health and energy; (4) sympathy for and understanding of people—with their troubles, sorrows, flaws, and joys; (5) openness and candor; and (6) intelligence. Many additional dimensions or facets can be identified.

Educational Statesmanship. The statesmanship criterion may be subsumed under other criteria just described, particularly personal values and presence. Statesmanship also relates to other criteria to come, e.g., political astuteness and economic and fiscal sophistication. Some might say that educational statesmanship represents the "highest value" in appraising a college president. But we list here certain items that could elicit judgments in an evaluation that seem relevant to statesmanship.

1. Is the president *committed* to the values of the life of the mind, the value of the examined life, the essentiality of academic freedom, the recognition of the need for autonomy for the scholar-researcher, respect for higher education as good in and of itself, and to the fundamental character of higher education as an institution that is a preserver and critic of western culture?
2. Does the president have personal courage in the face of adversity, conflict, or unpleasantness?
3. Is the president temperate in nature, not overly given to fault finding, open in his/her interactions with associates at all levels, considered to be fair and evenhanded in his/her dealing with people?
4. Does the president keep abreast of problems, obligations, and issues, including national issues? Does he/she face up to problems and issues when they arise? Does the administrator deal constructively with crises, seek consultation, and accept advice?
5. Is the president known as a person of complete integrity?

Political and Fiscal Astuteness. Some persons have said that all educational decisions are in the end political decisions. Academic administrators have to be alert to the political effects of institutional decisions, both *internal* and *external*. Examples that test political astuteness are of this order: methods of handling student aggression, consequences of a deficit, interpretation of athletic policy, support given an academic senate, rules concerning

alcohol on the campus or the dispensing of contraceptive information and devices by the student health service. The interests of the variety of constituencies of a college or university are not homogeneous; in fact, they are often in conflict. In the current milieu, decisions of an economic or fiscal character constantly are being made. Projections or alternative decisions can be critical to institutional well-being. Decisions in this area are also often of concern to many. Examples are of the following type: Shall a deficit be budgeted? How are merit increases to be handled? How should surplus funds in auxiliary enterprise accounts be invested, if at all? How can "soft money" be handled with minimum hazards to institutional stability? Should the institution grant honorary degrees?

The academic administrator will understand these types of situations and be aware that decisions that please one constituency may offend others. The academic administrator constantly is being tested and evaluated by those within the institution and by those without to determine how he/she handles conflicting demands.

Administrative Style. Most students of administration recognize the concept of administrative style. What is implied is that operations of a given administrator take on a characteristic of wholeness that can be characterized by just a few words, e.g., authoritarian and demanding, low-keyed and permissive, aggressive and dominating. In and of itself style may have little significance. On the other hand, a given style may be essential in a given institution, e.g., Reed College seems unable to tolerate an administrator who is in the least authoritarian. Cohen and March, in their volume, *Leadership and Ambiguity*, discuss performance of presidents associated with certain metaphors. This concept will be dealt with in Exhibit 6, but let us here affirm that criteria of style can be developed that deal with such characteristics as authoritarian, democratic, judicial, conciliating, and so on. The point is that style may be an important element of success or failure as a college is unionized, as the adversities of inflation and unemployment bear heavily on an institution, or as emotions rise when minority groups become aggressive or politicians infringe on institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

Unique Criteria

It has been noted in Burton Clark's *The Distinctive College*, for example, that on occasion a president will have a special quality and a special vision that force circumstances to conform to his/her will and thus he/she dominates an institution. Such a person, as president, may be evaluated in terms we have just outlined, but such an evaluation is in a sense

irrelevant because of the overriding power of a president to seem to make the institution his/her own. The word "charisma" has been used to describe or define such persons. Charisma denotes and connotes powers beyond the norm and powers that define the evaluation without reference to norms. Such as Clark notes, were Foster, who founded Reed College; Morgan, who formed the Antioch which has been distinctive for more than half a century; and Aydolotte, who remade Swarthmore. These individuals were of such power and unconventionality that a traditional or normative evaluation would miss the point. While such persons as just named are unique as leaders, such qualities as they possessed may show up in lesser degrees in the person of lesser presidents and should be recorded as part of an evaluation. Such qualities as superb oratory; capacity to attract large sums of money to a college or university; skill in being perceived as a beneficent, almost flawless person to students; or inspiration beyond the norm in motivating and guiding others are of the character we are calling attention to. If such a situation surrounds a president or other academic administrators, it must be part of the evaluation. These qualities are not confined to presidents. Liberty Hyde Bailey, who was dean of the college of agriculture at Cornell University from 1903 to 1913, appeared to many of his constituencies to be a person who could do no wrong. He led his college to a status of such prestige that he was more powerful than presidents, and his college was unrivaled in its quality.

It also must be recognized that certain characteristics may be fatal to success and demand an unfavorable evaluation despite other qualities highly esteemed. Such characteristics, if successfully concealed, may not be influential but, if known, make tenure hazardous or impossible. They are normally flaws of character—moral lapses or failure in financial integrity—but they may also be perceived as complete ineptness in, for example, a managerial role, misplaced trust in others, or an incapacity to delegate to others until a situation assumes pathological characteristics. An evaluation committee should be sensitive to the occasions when the administrator possesses a "fatal flaw."

The Criteria Situation—A Summing Up

We frequently have inferred that each evaluation is a unique event. It is thus to be acknowledged that each evaluation should be based on criteria relative to that evaluation. We have just discussed charismatic figures and also conditions where a "fatal flaw" is present. But neither set of criteria will be relevant to most evaluations. The *ad hoc committee* should review the categories of criteria deliberately as an evaluation gets under way and should determine which are criteria of high relevance and low relevance and thus direct their evaluations.

It constantly should be noted that evaluations almost always involve qualitative judgments. For example, it may be noted that a given administrator rarely if ever attends institutional social affairs, a quantitative judgment largely, but concluded that this state has no bearing on the administrator's performance, a qualitative judgment. Evaluation committees should not be fearful in making or recording qualitative judgments.

When considering the varieties of criteria, one should recognize that performance criteria carry a special power. Other criteria should not be downgraded; yet the old saying, "Judge me by what I do, not what I say," has to be respected. Performance criteria must be heavily weighted in an overall judgment.

The application of the criteria to a given situation requires sophistication of an evaluation committee. Such sophistication involves general understandings of colleges and universities, of the diversity of administrative roles, of the subtleties involved in superior versus modest performances, and in the nature of special cases. The sophisticated person has a sense of institutional history, traditions, even mythologies. The sophisticated person knows that strength can be weakness and vice versa, that expenditure of great energy or of long working hours may represent weakness rather than strength, and, finally, that *all human beings are flawed* and should be understood and judged as such.

Evaluation of administrators requires the application of multifaceted criteria, the willingness to make value judgments, and the courage to put institutional values on a level with personal commitments.

PART V: GUIDELINES FOR APPRAISALS

The variety of interests that may well be represented on an *ad hoc evaluation committee* have been noted. A modest statement concerning the contribution each can make to the evaluation has been noted. This section will extend these statements and will, in essence, lay out the format of the document the committee will prepare—the assessment portfolio.

The general format of the portfolio will be as follows:

1. There will be an introductory statement specifying the person and role being evaluated. This statement should review the general frame of reference out of which the administrator serves: institutional or educational unit history, role expectations and position requirements, special factors operating in regard to the position or pertinent place during a given time span, the dimensions of the unit served, and special features relating to that unit.
2. The person being evaluated will present a personal analysis or self-evaluation. This statement will be described in greater detail in *Exhibit 1*.
3. Each of the constituencies on the committee will make its statement and the statements shall be attributed to the constituencies. These include: (1) trustees, (2) peer administrators, (3) faculty, (4) students, (5) alumni, and (6) such others as the board may name to the committee.
4. The committee's consensus statement with dissents or minority positions, if any.

Item 1: Introductory Statement

We already have spoken sufficiently about this item on pages 13 and 14.

Item 2: Administrator's Self-Evaluation

The academic administrator's self-evaluation should not be written to any particular formula or outline. It should reflect the administrator's perceptions, personality, and personal style. *Exhibit 1* includes an outline for this statement that will serve as a norm for the self-evaluation, but the outline need not be followed with any great precision. The administrator may or may not choose to have his/her appraisal seen by anyone except members of the committee. It need not be a voluminous document, probably no less than 10 typed pages, nor more than 25. It will relate the administrator's service to the situation at time of appointment; expectations of others; and of the problems or opportunities that developed over the time

span of the administration; special situations or aspects of the role that were present or that developed; aspirations, successes, and less than successful undertakings; and unfinished business. Finally, it will include a summary statement of hindsight, foresight, and current status of administrative activity. It contains, in other words, those items described in Part I, "The Frame of Reference for Evaluation."

Item 3: Responsibilities of Constituent Members of the Evaluation Committee

The Board of Trustees. The representatives of the board should deal with larger issues, e.g., fiscal management, community and statewide relations, and leadership provided to the board. They should focus on such broad characteristics or qualities as statesmanship, political astuteness, boldness, courage, flexibility, and their opposites. The board representatives should note, from their perspective, special strengths and limitations. There should be a summary. (This role of trustees is restricted to presidential evaluations.)

Peer administrators will have special perspectives largely derived from more intimate and day-to-day interactions than are possible for other constituencies. They will be able to comment on administrator handling of management realities—fiscal, planning, staff selection and supervision, delegation of tasks, and so on. They should be able to comment on relationships with various constituencies both internal and external to the institution. They should speak to the item: the president as a person when evaluating the president. They can also comment in like manner regarding other administrators. Again, there should be a summing up.

The Faculty. The members of the faculty are perhaps the quickest to criticize and the last to praise, but their perspectives on presidents and other administrators must be known if a proper evaluation is to occur. The faculty has little time for a president in particular and administrators in general who have not in one way or another been successful in faculty roles. They want understanding; and, though they feel that understanding is not always insured if administrators have been one of them, they think it is least apt to occur when they have not. Hence, understanding that an administrator has published research reports or other scholarly works and has had some notice of his work is expected by the faculty. This understanding becomes operational when the president or other administrators not only acknowledge the wisdom of faculty participation in college or university governance but actually seek out and foster such participation.

Secondly, faculty expect the president and other academic administrators to speak out when academic freedom is threatened or breached. Academic administrators are expected to be pragmatists in interactions with the press and agents of other media, with

governors and legislatures, with trustees, and with professional, business, and industrial leaders. But faculty members expect presidents to support basic research, to support the humanities and the fine arts as well as the sciences or social sciences with their seemingly more applicable research and instruction, and to be more than understanding of the variety of lifestyles of faculties—be they artists, scholars, bohemians, aliens, the financially imprudent, those who are permissive about social deviations, or deviants themselves. They expect presidents and other academic administrators to respect tenure and due process and be enlightened concerning faculty rights and responsibilities.

Faculty expect academic administrators to be more than adequate spokespersons and interpreters concerning faculty values and commitments and the meaning of higher education to trustees, to students, to extrainstitutional bodies, and to the faculty themselves. The faculty want to be "in-the-know" concerning legislative behavior, budget balances and imbalances, and trustee concerns.

Faculty want presidents and academic administrators to represent in their own person, college and university values—scholarliness, refinement, and statesmanship. They want him/her to be energetic, prudent, hard working, candid, open, and available.

It is to these concerns that faculty members of an evaluation committee should address themselves. It has been said that faculties possess an infinite capacity for sabotage, and so they do. Hence, faculty on evaluation committees should be scrupulous to tell it just as they see it, fairly and conscientiously, but with courage when needed.

The faculty perspective should be a faculty perspective, not an attempt to be a universal judge and evaluator. It should be balanced, descriptive, evaluative, and, in the end, serve the total institution and all its people.

Students. Students' participation in a variety of college and university governance areas and in evaluation of academic administrators should be welcomed. But such participation can be perplexing. At times, it appears that students simply are being coopted, or conned—that their contributions are really insignificant and unimportant. At other times, students seem to be overwhelmingly ignorant or uninformed and naive, sometimes cruel, arrogant, or even positively dangerous to the well-being of the institution. The only proper basis of using students in evaluation situations is to believe their contributions are normally constructive. But students so involved should recognize their limited perspective and understanding, that they do not carry the burden of judgment completely, and that presidents and other administrators have interests to attend to that are competing with student interest. On balance, student evaluations should be valid and helpful. Their contributions can have a freshness

and spontaneity and the wisdom of relative innocence that can balance the seemingly sophisticated observations and judgments of the more mature.

Item 4: Final Responsibilities of the Committee as a Whole

The completed assessment profile should be a completely balanced document inasmuch as it must represent the variety of interests that care about the college or university. It must not let any feature of the evaluation be overdone or dominate the profile unless that result is judged proper. While the evaluations of the various evaluations are discreet, they should appear to be a whole—completely representative of a comprehensive evaluation.

There is a need for a summing-up statement. This statement can introduce the evaluation document or conclude it. The evaluators should strive to make a consensus statement, but conflicting evaluations should not be covered up. Minority opinion, either favorable or unfavorable to the person being evaluated, should be revealed. But it should be a firm statement, not equivocal, not readily given to being misunderstood or misinterpreted. In the end, it should be worthy of the committee and should serve the person being evaluated and the college or university in which the administrator works.

PART VI: RESOURCE MATERIALS FOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

It should be understood by now that this monograph presents an evaluation model that is essentially a series of essays—descriptive, analytic, and judgmental. It does not advocate checklists or similar devices of evaluation that presume to be more objective, more precise, and, on occasion, quantitative. It does not state that the latter forms of presentation are valueless; it does suggest that heavy reliance on them is severely limiting if one seeks to secure a comprehensive and valid evaluation of an academic administrator.

This section of the monograph presents a series of exhibits that can be used as guides in preparing evaluations or that are suggestive of words, phrases, areas of performance, and so on that will enliven or complete an evaluation. They should be viewed as aids, not as instruments.

Also as part of this section, verbal descriptions of administrators—presidents, vice presidents and deans—derived from the writings of successful administrators or from the analyses of students of college and university administration are presented. These statements should help evaluators to define elements of administrative tasks or performances, to perceive a variety of emphases that have been advocated, and perhaps to clarify thoughts about quality of character, strengths and limitations of human performances, and that elusive but significant wholeness of role fulfillment called administrative style.

Exhibit 1 suggests an outline for use by an administrator in preparing his/her self-analysis or self-evaluation.

Exhibit 2 discusses and outlines performance activities as areas of evaluation.

Exhibit 3 is a list of 38 nouns that, with appropriate modifiers, may be suggestive to evaluators in formulating a comprehensive statement of the administrator qua administrator.

Exhibit 4 presents a list of adjectives with qualifiers or examples that can be used to formulate a statement concerning the administrator as a manager.

Exhibit 5 deals with areas of understanding that the administrator may demonstrate he/she possesses or does not possess, e.g., his/her understanding of the nature of power, academic freedom, or organizational effectiveness.

Exhibit 6 is a series of "presidential" role expectations derived from metaphors related to organization taken directly from *Leadership and Ambiguity* by Cohen and March.

Exhibit 7 is a presentation of a variety of descriptions of the presidency and of other academic administrator posts as perceived by former administrators or students of administration.

Exhibit 8 is a literature review and bibliography.

Elements of a President's or Other Administrator's Self-Analysis

We have said that a rather essential feature of the evaluation model proposed here is a presidential (or other administrator's) self-review or self-analysis. The evaluation committee should want this statement for two reasons: first, to determine the administrator's perception of his/her task at the time of appointment, and second, to get his/her estimate of how well he/she has performed or otherwise met the commitments of the administrative role. This kind of statement may temper or reinforce a constituent's evaluation. The preparation of this statement should help the administrator sharpen his/her perspectives and insights about role performance by seeing consistencies, inconsistencies, or ambiguities in his/her activities; by weighing his/her attributes and limitations to carry on in the current position; and, later, by testing his/her perceptions against those of the evaluation committee.

An outline is provided here that may be used by an administrator as a guide to his/her self-analysis. It is not essential for the analysis to follow the outline. The point of the report, as noted above, is to help the constituencies understand the administrator's conception of his/her role, how the administrator perceives his/her performance over the tenure period, and how he/she rationalizes it. The administrator can use the outline as is, modify it, or discard it and make his/her own.

I. Administrator Concept of Role

- A. Expectations at time of appointment
 - 1. How these were arrived at:
 - a. board statements
 - b. administrator's analysis of the role in terms of institutional needs and constraints
- B. Administrator's developing conceptions or perceptions over time as to what the trustees and other constituencies expected of him/her
 - 1. the administrator's perception in the earlier period of service, perhaps after 12 to 18 months
 - 2. perception of current administrator task demands and shifts since the earlier days of service
- C. Current task demands as the administrator sees them and his/her assessment of constituency perceptions

II. On-the-Job Performance

- A. How well have the tasks of the administrator been performed over time?
 - 1. What was done well?
 - 2. What was done modestly well?

II. On-the-Job Performance (cont.)

- A. 3. Where was there minimal task accomplishment or even complete lack of success?
- 4. How has adaptation to changing demands or circumstances over the years of service been handled?
- B. Rationalization of task performance
 - 1. Strengths of the administrator that were used
 - 2. Strengths that were not tested or used and why
 - 3. Situations that developed in which task demands and administrator competence were not matched, i.e., limitations seemingly inherent in the administrator or expectations of constituencies that were misplaced. Examples: containing student violence, failure to find adequate financial resources, failure actively to seek to accomplish affirmative action or further equal opportunity goals in admissions and appointments, or inability to establish institutional support with the community. What was the explanation, if any?
 - 4. Environmental factors (e.g., external intrusions of a political character, shifts in board composition that made exemplary performance difficult)
 - 5. Crisis points or unanticipated situations that developed during the tenure period and how they were handled (e.g., shift in the job market for graduates, major shift in the character of state and federal funding, or unionization of faculty). A family circumstance could be noted as a factor in performance (e.g., serious and long-term illness of the administrator or of an important colleague, long illness or death of a spouse)

III. An Assessment or Evaluation

- A. Successes and failures and why
 - 1. With constituencies (e.g., trustees, faculty)
 - 2. In various areas (e.g., education, public relations, fiscal affairs, long-range planning)
 - 3. Elements leading to success or non-success
 - a. cooperation of others
 - b. personal characteristics
 - c. training and prior experience or lack thereof
- B. Evaluation of managerial role—successes and failures and why
 - 1. Staff recruitment and supervision
 - 2. Productivity and efficiency of accomplishments
 - 3. Organizational changes accomplished for better performance
 - 4. Plant development or renovation
 - 5. Items not well-managed or neglected (e.g., campus security, residence halls, and food service)
- C. A personal assessment, job satisfaction, look to the future, and a summing up

Performance Activities as Evaluation Areas

Whatever way one wishes to describe a college or university administrator and attach value judgments to the description, performance will weigh heavily in the complete statement. In recent years, the concept of "management-by-objectives" has been seized upon by many as being the essence of role definition, anticipation of performance, and evaluation following performance. An objective may well be of the following types: to bring the budget into balance, to increase alumni support through annual giving, or to reorganize the administrative staff to achieve greater efficiency and intra-staff communication.

These concepts are useful. While many students of the administration of complex institutions, universities being one, would find "management-by-objectives" a limiting concept in describing something as complex as a presidential role or even part of a comprehensive role, the concept of performance objectives, we repeat, is useful.

The concept is also appealing in its apparent objectivity and freedom from need to discuss and evaluate processes associated with performance. In addition, the concept does relate to aspects of role that are visible and often amenable to explicit and even quantitative evaluation, e.g., "increases" in enrollments, endowments, library holding, value of federal grants received, or numbers of faculty. While it is treacherous to place too much emphasis or faith on performance and its measurement or rating, we would not wish the evaluation of performance to be ignored in the process proposed in this monograph.

The following outline of performance activity is not entirely inclusive. However, we hope it covers the major categories of administrative performance, that the sub-items are sufficient for an evaluator to make his/her own list for a specific evaluation situation, and for the evaluator to make a judgment regarding the performance items.

This list will serve the evaluators in dealing with day-to-day routines, cumulative over time, that need to be judged. It also will serve evaluators in identifying areas of great strengths or grave limitations—identifications discussed in the criteria section of the monograph as sometimes critically significant in evaluation.

Performance Activity by Categories
Specific Activities and Description of Specific Performances
(The list is limited, not all inclusive.)

I. Leadership Activity

- A. Interpreting Institutional Goals and Mission Through (1) Speaking, (2) Writing, (3) Personal Lifestyle.**
 - 1. To extrainstitutional constituencies
 - a. Governmental
 - (1) testimony to legislative committees—names and dates
 - (2) hosting campus visits for government officials—occasions and dates
 - b. Local Business and Industrial Associations
 - (1) service on Chamber of Commerce committees—kinds and amounts
 - (2) lectures before service clubs and interest groups—names and dates
 - 2. To intrainstitutional constituencies
 - a. Board of Trustees
 - (1) presentations of specific activities by college deans
 - (2) president's annual report
 - b. Faculty
 - (1) appearances before academic senate
 - c. Students
- B. Identification and Defense of Institutional Values**
 - 1. Interpretations of the values of academic freedom and tenure
 - 2. Defense or interpretation of the nature of basic research and worth
 - 3. Fostering or enhancing such activities as: music and art (e.g., a string quartet in residence), recognition of outstanding teaching, establishing distinguished professorships for distinguished service or research, insisting on distinctive architecture in new buildings
 - 4. Maintaining scholarly productivity while serving as an administrator
- C. Mediation of Conflict**
 - 1. Fostering town and gown interactions
 - 2. Interpreting faculty activity to student groups
 - 3. Negotiating contracts with unions
 - 4. Adjudicating and minimizing intercollege rivalries
 - 5. Working for consensus on policy issues among trustees
- D. Initiating New Activities of Quality**
 - 1. Curricular reform
 - 2. New and needed degree programs
 - 3. Adding to community service repertoire
 - 4. Founding centers or institutions to deal with explicit areas of national purpose

This outline will be extended to include such categories as the following:

II. Managerial Activities

- A. Fiscal management
- B. Personnel management
- C. Plant and other resource management
- D. Management of student services
- E. Management of support systems (e.g., libraries, printing services, university press)

III. Public Relations Activities

- A. Attending ceremonies and special events
- B. Cultivating sources of financial support
- C. Interpreting institutional goals and missions to external constituencies
- D. Maintaining loyalty of alumni

IV. Short- and Long-Range Planning Activities

- A. Budget preparation
- B. Curriculum development
- C. Institutional research and techniques to organize information
- D. Physical plant expansion and/or maintenance
- E. Student enrollment—undergraduate, graduate

V. Public Service—Local, State, National, International

- A. Developing support for foreign students
- B. Establishing courses and programs to meet specific needs of local community, state, nation
- C. Formulating policies concerning research and consulting
- D. Offering assistance to developing institutions
- E. Providing for use of facilities by non-student groups in the community

Descriptors: A Shopping List

The following list of nouns that can be used in describing an administrator and adjectives that can qualify them is presented simply as an aid to evaluators as they grope for words to use in their evaluations. It is not to be assumed that they have any specific utility in defining the dimensions of an evaluation. They may help an evaluator as he/she looks over the list to say, for example, "Yes, Mr. X has courage and patience and that should be noted in my evaluation"; or "Yes, Ms. Y anticipates; she is a person of vision; she sees today's problem but also looks far ahead." The list may help to identify limitations in specific terms, e.g., "Mrs. T. does not understand the need to pace herself; she often appears to have overworked and to be hurried"; or, "Mr. V is a man of modest ambition. This is reflected in his statements concerning institutional goals."

<i>Noun</i>	<i>Adjectives and phrases (not a complete list) both positive and negative</i>
1. Accountable	Meticulous, capricious, not understood, limited
2. Ambition	Modest, seasoned, proper
3. Anticipation	Sees far ahead, lives by the day, short-range vision exclusively
4. Appearance	Neat, flamboyant, unkempt
5. Articulation (verbal communication)	Limited, superior
6. Assurance	Timid, confident, his/her own person, limited, never at a loss
7. Chance taking (boldness)	Limited, foolhardy, conservative
8. Charisma	None, much, modest, used, not understood
9. Commitment	Complete, absent, modest
10. Contentment	Serene, lazy, relaxed, restless
11. Courage	Bold, lacking, modest
12. Evaluation	Has a sense for it, never seems to bother to evaluate, capricious and erratic, careful and reliable
13. Firmness	None, appropriate, stubborn
14. Harmony	Outstanding, uncertain, limited
15. Health	Excellent, good, poor
16. Humor	Broad, pleasant, lacking
17. Integrity	Complete, absolute, qualified, lacking in

<i>Noun</i>	<i>Adjectives and phrases (not a complete list) both positive and negative</i>
18. Intelligence	Superior, adequate, limited
19. Intuition or Gut Feelings	Not to be trusted, generally correct
20. Leadership	Limited, missing, natural
21. Loyalty	Absolute, missing, adequate
22. Management	Strong, weak, vacillating
23. Pacing	Often overworked, never hurried, crises are anticipated
24. Patience	Limited, none, great
25. Planning	Has little sense of planning, views as important, technically skillful
26. Recruitment	Recognizes talent, fears talent, judgment is indifferent, not sensitive to talent
27. Scholarship	Limited, none, nationally recognized
28. Self-Perception	Limited, has high validity, erratic
29. Solvency	Unqualified, troublesome
30. Speaking (large audiences)	Impressive, uneven, limited
31. Speaking (small groups)	Dominating, sharing, impressive
32. Temperament	Limited, erratic, permissive, even, excitable
33. Tolerance	Nonexistent, broad and basic, limited, erratic
34. Veracity	Unqualified, unreliable
35. Visibility	None, local, national, international
36. Vision	Limited, limitless, modest
37. Work Habits	Methodical, uneven, erratic, undisciplined, disciplined
38. Writing	Adequate, impressive, faulted

Managerial Competency: Descriptors

The previous list was one of descriptors that might touch on a variety of qualities possessed by an individual. They are in a major sense *personal* in their connotations. The list which follows is much more relevant to describe managerial performance. Again, it is not definitive or complete. It should not be deemed to circumscribe a given evaluator's description of managerial performance. It is meant to be useful, but it may be ignored.

<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Qualification or Example</i>
1. Accountable	Accepts responsibility, passes the buck, apologetic, open and candid
2. Accurate	Completely dependable, must be checked
3. Anxious	Normally so, seldom so, on a few occasions
4. Careless	Frequently, seldom, never
5. Conservative	Does not take chances, not bold
6. Decisive	Seldom, usually, markedly so
7. Delegates	Unable to delegate, overdoes it
8. Efficient	One hundred percent, not a strength
9. Erratic	Cannot be predicted, hard to follow
10. Even-handed	is the same with everyone, plays favorites
11. Independent (autonomous)	Needs practically no supervision, requires constant feedback
12. Liberal	Open, takes chances, willing to change
13. Productive	Much more than adequate, adequate
14. Prompt	No unwarranted delays, seldom on time
15. Punctual	Always punctual, frequently late
16. Stable	Opposite of erratic
17. Understanding (of people)	That all are flawed, patient

Administrator Understanding of the Academic Enterprise

It frequently has been said that knowledge is power. The statement is entirely valid. If one can go beyond knowledge to understanding, power is enhanced. Few things are more valuable to the administrator than understanding of the academic enterprise. Among other uses, understanding permits the administrator to do that which can be done and prevents the attempt of that which is impossible in the academic setting. The following questions can be useful to evaluators in helping them to identify and judge the understanding of higher education as an institution and as a process by presidents, vice presidents, deans, and other academic administrators.¹ The list, however, is couched in terms of presidents.

1. How well does the president *understand* the purpose of his/her institution? How well does the person interpret this purpose so that he/she is convincing to others? To what degree do his/her decisions reflect his/her understandings?
2. How well does the president understand the nature of power? his/her power? the basis of his/her power? How frequently is the use of his/her power manifest? To what ends is it used? How does he/she misuse the power, and how frequently?
3. How broad and deep or limited and shallow is the president's experience? In what areas does the person seem naive? Has he/she internalized and conceptualized his/her experience? Is his/her experience perceived and acknowledged by his/her constituencies? Is his/her experience relevant to current demands? To what degree?
4. How does the president handle success? Does the person know when he/she is succeeding or not succeeding? Can he/she acknowledge failure, understand it, and accept it? How much fun is he/she having as president? If modest or little, why?
5. How well does the president understand the nature of the college or university as an organization? Does the person know why criteria of productivity and efficiency have limited utility in evaluating the worth of a college or university? Does he/she understand consensus and work to achieve it as a base for policy? Does he/she understand the need for bureaucratic structure in a university and also why members of faculties scorn them? Does he/she understand that colleges or universities must transcend organizational constraints by becoming institutions, i.e., organizations that are infused with value?

¹A review of Cohen and March's *Leadership and Ambiguity* was helpful in preparing these questions.

6. How well does the president understand the utility and limitations of line and staff organizations? Can the person delegate? Can he/she find satisfaction in the success of other administrators? Can the president understand the nature and power of the informed system? of the necessity for and the care that must be given to communication? Is the president able to handle ambiguity and understand that ambiguity is not necessarily an organizational pathology?
7. Does the president have a sense of timing? Does the person understand and respect that there is a time when certain action is appropriate, that action can be both premature or too long delayed? Does the president normally seize his/her opportunities or do too many opportunities pass him/her by?
8. Does the president have a sense of his/her own person? how others perceive him/her? Does he/she have an idea of his/her strengths? limitations? what is possible and what is not possible for him/her to do? Does the president understand his/her own health, energy quotient, and tolerance for stress? Does he/she know when to persist and when to quit? what is important and should command his/her time and energy? what is of limited significance or even frivolous and should be ignored?

Descriptions of Administrator Roles

Cohen and March in their significant and interesting book, *Leadership and Ambiguity*,¹ present a series of what they label "metaphors" and associated descriptions of college or university presidential roles. These descriptions should be useful to evaluators in that they may see a particular administrator playing or living a role resembling to some degree a role that is in Cohen and March's book. An evaluator may very well be able to read the descriptions and say to himself/herself: "President X obviously reflects the authoritarian metaphor"; or "President Y is representative of both the collective bargaining and the consensus metaphor with emphasis on the latter." These descriptions also in a sense describe what I have designated presidential style. Of course, other administrators also display a settled manner of behavior that can be designated as an administrative style.

It has been this writer's experience that the style of an administrator as it is congruent/incongruent with a particular institutional environment will have much to do with the administrator's satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with his/her role and with the acceptance by the constituencies of him/her as an administrator.

Members of an evaluation committee should not expect to see a necessary congruence between the administrator they are evaluating and a particular administrative style, but a review of the material presented below may be helpful in preparing descriptions of the given administrator.

"Each of our metaphors implicitly prescribes a role for the president of a university:

<i>Metaphor</i>	<i>Presidential Role</i>
Competitive market	The college president is an entrepreneur. He may establish any kind of organization he wishes within the constraints imposed by the willingness of students, faculty, donors, and legislators to take their support elsewhere.
Administration	College presidents are appointed by the trustees to pursue the objectives specified by the board and are evaluated in terms of the performance of the organization with respect to those objectives. The major tasks of the president involve controlling the operation to ensure conformity with the objectives, coordinating the several subunits toward that end, assuring consistency within the organization, and avoiding duplication of activities and waste.

¹Pages 38-39. Copyright by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1974. Used with permission of McGraw-Hill Book Company.

<i>Metaphor</i>	<i>Presidential Role</i>
Collective bargaining	The college president does two things: First, he attempts to mediate disputes between the interests in the university and help them to find mutually satisfactory agreements. In this activity, he is a facilitator of compromise or invention. Second, he supervises the implementation of the agreements, serving each of the interests to the degree specified by the bargaining outcomes.
Democracy	The college president sees himself as a hypothetical candidate for the office and offers promises of policy action in exchange for promises of support. His objective is to maintain a winning coalition of interest groups by responding to their demands for university policy.
Consensus	The presidential role involves three major activities: the management of the agendas, the public solicitation of consensus, and the implementation of agreements. The president responds to demands by placing them on the agenda for discussion, by inducing a discussion of them, and by implementing them if they survive the discussion.
Anarchy	The president is a catalyst. He gains his influence by understanding the operation of the system and by inventing viable solutions that accomplish his objectives rather than by choosing among conflicting alternatives. 'Management' in an anarchy involves the substitution of knowledge and subtle adjustment for the explicit authoritative control of bureaucracy.
Independent judiciary	The college president is not expected to reflect or adjust to the demands of a current set of actors, consumers, constituents, owners, or employees. Rather, he is expected to capture the historic truths of the university as an institution and to reflect those truths during a brief trusteeship.
Plebiscitary autocracy	The president is a decision maker and organizer of opinion. Such consultation or assistance as he uses is simply a convenience to him and imposes no obligation to him to follow the advice. He acts on the objectives as he sees them and subsequently attempts to persuade his constituency that his rule should be continued."

Other Descriptions of Administrator Roles

Materials included in this exhibit may assist the evaluator to appreciate and understand the variety of dimensions of the administrator's role and how to describe and be judgmental in qualifying the descriptions. The emphasis is on the college or university president, but the concepts and descriptions are transferable with a little thought for consideration of other administrators.

Presidents are viewed as several former presidents have perceived them and as they have published their perceptions. They are: Frederick deW. Bolman, Harold Dodds, Joseph Kauffman, Clark Kerr, Harold Stoke, and Henry Wriston. The majority speak to the *college* presidency except that Dodds and Kauffman also add to their reviews the *university* presidency and Kerr speaks directly to the *university* presidency per se.

Perceptions of other academic administrators (deans and vice presidents) are not as cogent and numerous as those of former presidents, but we have included some observations or descriptions concerning these administrators.

Bolman on the *College Presidency*¹

According to Bolman, the role of the college president and the requisite personal characteristics to perform the job will vary in accordance with the needs and aspirations of particular institutions. The most realistic process for a search committee is to abandon the idea of looking for the "perfect" candidate and to concentrate on prospects whose outstanding characteristics are related to areas in which the college's needs will be greatest. This type of orientation on the part of the search committee necessitates analysis of the institution and analysis of the president's role prior to the screening of potential candidates. From Bolman's point of view, the same process presumably would be advantageous in the evaluation of an incumbent president since quality of performance could be judged against the defined presidential role and institutional needs.

Because the president's role essentially is determined by the institution where he/she serves, Bolman explores only the most basic of personal characteristics. These include academic stature, administrative acumen, personality, qualities of the spouse, religion, and political affiliation. On the basis of a study of 135 colleges and universities, Bolman concludes that only academic stature is a quality that universally could be deemed important for all college presidents. This quality is stressed because commanding the respect of the faculty requires that the president is or was "one of them." Academic stature is equated with possession of an earned doctorate, usually a Ph.D. degree.

Administrative acumen normally is thought to be crucial, but it may be defined in different ways such as decisiveness, ability to command the respect of government leaders, or success in raising funds. Personality traits may be given emphasis when priority is placed on improving the college's image or when better relationships are sought with members of the legislature. A "good" spouse may be considered important to the president's role and the administrator could be seriously handicapped at some colleges if his/her spouse is unacceptable in some way. At a few institutions, religious and political affiliation may be deemed characteristics, although little concern with these matters is detected in the author's comments.

¹Frederick deW. Bolman, *How College Presidents Are Chosen* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965).

Dodds on the Role of the *Academic President*¹

Dodds recognizes a degree of commonality among the responsibilities of college and university presidents. The position entails managerial responsibility, for example, to delegate authority to individuals who will see to the performance of particular operations. The position also requires awareness of the unique organizational aspects of the institution as exemplified by the high degree of emphasis on consultation which occurs in the governance process. In practice, all presidents are involved in general activities such as guiding, unifying, representing, defending, and inspiring their institutions. These activities call for an ability to get along with people, a sense of humor, physical and emotional health, and the capacity for growth. In all cases the job of academic president necessitates managerial competence and a talent for educational leadership.

The question Dodds raises is whether the academic president ought to be primarily an educational leader or an institutional manager/caretaker. From the author's point of view, the president should stress the role of educational leader while letting business operations of the college or university be the main concern of other administrators. The quality of a president's educational leadership will be determined by his/her ability to engender and sustain a spirit of critical inquiry and self-examination on the part of faculty and trustees.

The president should prod the faculty and trustees to think seriously about the goals of their programs and institution and to state the goals as explicitly as possible. Once these goals have been formulated, the president has a responsibility to articulate them frequently and vigorously to the public. Because the faculty tends to have highly specialized interests, the president has a special obligation to direct attention to the interests of the organization as a whole. If the president is to succeed in creating an environment conducive to careful organizational self-analysis and the possibility of generating worthwhile innovations, then the exercise of educational leadership is imperative.

Educational leadership, as Dodds emphasizes it, is more closely related to the president's judicious selection of issues raised and the objectivity of his/her arguments than to the manipulation of people and ideas merely for the encouragement of discontent or divisiveness. Leadership also is related to the president's ability to follow through on the issues he/she

¹Harold W. Dodds, *The Academic President—Educator or Caretaker?* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

raises and policies he/she supports. In short, the academic president's exercise of leadership involves the courage to speak frankly and openly to the faculty and board of trustees, while always maintaining the flexibility and willingness to reexamine his/her own values and pronouncements.

Kauffman on *College and University Presidents*¹

Kauffman advocates a strong leadership role for a college or university president because the chief executive is the major link among all the constituencies involved with the institution. The constituencies look to the president both for effective management and clarification of the values for which the institution stands. The president uses his/her knowledge and leadership to formulate policy in response to the challenges and opportunities facing the college.

Since public institutions increasingly are responsive and dependent on governmental authority, the college president also displays effective political leadership to assure that the interests of his/her college are represented. The president's role requires traditional management skills, but competition for funds and demands for public accountability lead to a management style that is distinctly political.

Previous experience as a senior administrator and commitment to the type of institution he/she heads are basic characteristics for a college president that Kauffman seems to find relevant. The necessary personal qualities of a president cannot be specified in any detail, however, without first understanding the character and needs of the institution where the executive functions. In other words, desirable qualities are determined primarily by the situation rather than by the person. This implies that the institution is able to define its present condition and values in fairly specific terms, and can ascertain the personal qualities most likely to be an asset in furthering those values.

¹Joseph F. Kauffman, *The Selection of College and University Presidents* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974).

Kerr on the *University Presidency*¹

Kerr's comments regarding the roles of university presidents are directed toward what he terms the "multiversity," and his discussion should be understood within that context. Multiversity is used by Kerr to denote the pluralistic character of the modern, large university which is evidenced by the pursuit of several purposes, service to many markets and concern for many publics, power conflicts, and lack of a single, unified community. In this type of environment the university president can be expected to assume at least three or four roles, including gladiator, initiator, image maker, and mediator.

The gladiator strives for freedom and quality; the initiator seeks change and places progress above peace in the university; the image maker works to improve his/her own and the institution's image for the sake of the university's continuity and improvement. Most of all, however, the president in the multiversity is a mediator, because as the university has grown larger and more complex it has become more enmeshed in the process of checks and balances. There are more parties to conciliate and fewer to lead. In some respects the mediator serves a function analogous to that of the clerk at a meeting who manages the agenda, draws forth ideas, and keeps the business moving.

The president's role of mediation, as Kerr would have us understand it, does encompass more than carrying messages between opposing actors without contributing ideas and principles of his own. Instead, the mediator interjects his/her own leadership into the disposition of a given problem in order to find a solution that is effective in the long run rather than a compromise for the time being. This means that the president must be able to gain access to each center of power. Then he/she must be able to argue his/her point of view as forcefully as the circumstances require. Although the personal characteristics necessary to fulfill the role of mediator are not specified, Kerr suggests that evaluation of the president be made on the basis of whether the mediation permits progress in the right direction to be made fast enough—or whether the conservatism of the institution takes precedence over needed change.

¹Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University, with a "Postscript-1972"* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972).

Stoke on the *College President*¹

Stoke views the role of the college president to be more nearly one of academic manager than innovator or leader. The president has a unique role in clarifying the purposes of his/her institution and selecting appropriate means by which to achieve the desired ends. In this respect the president's philosophy of education is highly important since it gives the institution a sense of direction and guides the administrator in the process of day-to-day decision making. Yet, the growing complexity of institutions of higher education gradually has transformed the president from an intellectual leader to a manager who is skilled in administration and serves as a broker in personal and public relations.

Very little of the president's time is devoted to matters that are strictly educational. The president is absorbed in social activities, fund raising, speech making and ceremonial functions, and correspondence of all kinds. He/she seldom has time for the relaxation, personal reflection, or planning that effective educational leadership requires. In light of the activities which occupy a president's energy, the traditional requirement of educational distinction seems less relevant to successful performance than does a winning personality, management skill, and previous success in business or administration.

Despite perceived change in the president's role, Stoke maintains that some of the more traditional qualities of college presidents still are in order. First, the president accepts the responsibilities of his/her position. He/she rejects the idea of "passing the buck" because decision-making authority in fact has been delegated to him/her. Self-protection is not the president's primary concern and he/she accepts the fact that he/she will not be applauded by all constituencies all of the time. Second, the president displays and encourages a respect for due process, which consists of giving an appropriate amount of consideration to the interests of those directly concerned with a specific issue or problem. Concern for due process is consistent with the role of manager or broker, and the more complex the institution the more skilled the president must be in order to assure that due process is observed.

Third, the president is able to facilitate the exchange of information among different interests so that hostility can be minimized. The president can diffuse tensions between the strictly business and the academic points of view, for example, by showing them that all expenditures are made for the objective of "producing education" and that the interests of one

¹Harold W. Stoke, *The American College President* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959).

group are not opposed to those of the other. In much the same way, the president serves to educate the board of trustees. The president has considerable information at hand and he/she should be able to state his/her views effectively and bring the most pressing issues to the attention of the board. The entire function of facilitating exchange of information implies that the president has some degree of analytical ability and the capacity to discern reality by using the information available to him/her. Otherwise, the president's credibility soon will be undermined.

A special duty of the president—to bridge the gap between faculty and administrators—encompasses the qualities suggested above. Stoke believes that an important source of conflict has surfaced because the faculty believes its influence to be on the decline and administrators are less able to understand the language and concerns of the scholar. The very specialization of the faculty requires a broad perspective and understanding on the part of the president and a concern over purposes and ends as opposed to methods and subject matter. In the widest context, Stoke implies that ideally the president should bridge the gaps among all the constituencies of the institution. If such an outcome ever is to be approximated, the president will need to describe the whole in such a way that it at least can be understood by all the constituent parts. Functioning in such a role, the college president would be more nearly an academic manager than an innovator or leader.

Wriston Reflects on the *College Presidency*¹

Wriston says that the central role of the president is to do everything he/she can—and to facilitate everything that others can do—in order to develop students to their full capacity as independently thinking and acting individuals. As the chief administrator there are actions to be taken that in the long run affect the quality of the students who will be graduated. These include raising adequate financial resources, developing a capable staff, and mediating between trustees and faculty. In order to accomplish these tasks, the president must possess qualities of wisdom, experience, warmth, sympathy, and insight; above all, the president must have a bountiful supply of energy. Because the president sets the pace of an institution, he/she should not hesitate to retire when his/her energy begins to wane.

The extent to which the president succeeds in his/her role is dependent upon an understanding of the limitations of presidential power and the wise use of it. The president's power is real; but it is highly circumscribed by the college's bureaucracy, the political nature of the president's office, and the actions of individuals with no policy-making authority whatsoever. It is deemed critical for the president to exercise power sparingly so that the limited supply of power is not exhausted prematurely. As an alternative, he/she should seek to influence those about him/her by the fullest use of persuasion. The president's most important power is, in fact, the power to persuade. Persuasion is necessary in order to interpret the will of the trustees to the faculty and to enable them to work in harmony insofar as possible.

Wriston concentrates on the president's persuasiveness with faculty as the key element in successful operation of a college or university. In a slightly different context, Richard Neustadt also emphasizes the supremacy of persuasion when he describes the essence of the U.S. President's task as one of convincing the legislators whose support he courts "that what the White House wants of them is what they ought to do for their sake and on their authority."²

For Wriston, persuasion proves to be an especially important skill because the college president has no real power to command a faculty member; and, at larger institutions, the president has little time to become involved in selection of teaching staff who share his/her

¹Henry M. Wriston, *Academic Procession: Reflections of a College President* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).

²Richard E. Neustadt, *Presidential Power* (New York: 1960), p. 34.

views. Probably the best way to win the faculty's support and render them susceptible to persuasion is through the ability to provide the best possible environment for teaching and research. In establishing such an environment, the college president also fulfills a major part of his/her responsibility for promoting students' growth and development since they will benefit from the high quality of instruction that results.

The Public Affairs Vice President¹

Salmen finds the role of the vice president for public affairs to center on maintaining a necessary balance among primarily off-campus, nonacademic functions, including development, annual fund, alumni affairs, public relations, and liaison with local, state, and federal governments. Although the president has the greatest visibility with respect to public relations, it often is impossible for him/her to know what should be said about a particular issue. In such case, the vice president for public affairs can help to formulate a statement; in many instances, the vice president can serve as the spokesperson of the university.

The vice president should have a knowledge of government agencies and should involve himself/herself in negotiations that may lead to policies affecting the university. However, he/she also must appoint an institutional representative to the governments, since the duties of the vice president require considerable time spent on campus. At the institution, the vice president may want to make suggestions about university publications such as the college catalog and newspaper advertisements, even though these matters are not his/her direct responsibility. He/she may become involved in such issues because the public image of the institution is an overriding concern. At times, the vice president's opinions will be unheeded.

Two factors are viewed to be important for success in the position of vice president for public affairs. These are a high degree of awareness of institutional goals and mutual respect and cooperation between him/her and the president. The latter requirement is especially critical because there is an interdependence between the two on the formulation of the institution's public positions.

¹Stanley Salmen, *Duties of Administrators in Higher Education* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971).

The Academic Dean¹

Gould's point of view on the role and characteristics of academic deans is based upon his own experiences as a faculty member and on the results of a study he conducted at a number of public and private colleges and universities of varying enrollments. An important consideration is that no two academic deanships will be exactly alike, in part because the role is derived through separate institutional traditions, the incumbent dean's personal ambition and interests, and the nature of the president's abilities or concerns. Related factors which shape the dean's role include the method of his/her selection, the tenure of the office, and the size of the institution itself.

Despite an acknowledged diversity of specific functions that may be performed by an academic dean, the central responsibility of the office-holder is to know the faculty well and to strengthen their loyalties to themselves and to the particular college or university they serve. Gould finds that most academic deans do not adopt strong leadership roles in order to carry out the responsibilities of their positions. Instead, the academic dean is more nearly a catalyst who plants ideas at will but waits to let the informal processes of the organization determine which suggestions take root and grow. The patience required in such a role necessarily precludes an overtly energetic leadership posture.

Gould believes that the academic dean in some instances should assume a more active leadership role in appraising the goals of his/her institution and evaluating the extent to which the resources under his/her direction are utilized in ways consistent with institutional purposes. An increased leadership role would require not only patience, good judgment, and knowledge of the process of academic communication, but also the willingness to voice recommendations that will benefit the *entire* institution, to help the faculty see potential points of consensus, and to accept risks and the possibility of being misunderstood in some situations.

Gould finds that the effective academic dean—whether adopting the role of catalyst or of leader—displays some distinguishing characteristics. For example, the effective dean enjoys the respect and confidence of his/her faculty and he/she prods the faculty toward excellence. The dean delegates routine work that can be handled competently by others and develops people who can assume responsibility for discharging such tasks. The dean is a

¹John Wesley Gould, *The Academic Deanship* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1964).

person of integrity and consistent in his/her dealings with others, always slow to anger and open to suggestions. Finally, he/she remains loyal to the standards of the academic profession.

65

70

The Academic Dean¹

Wicke suggests that deans are individuals in the middle by definition since the position entails obligations both to the president and to the faculty. The academic dean's responsibilities are associated with the educational mission of a college or university, and a leadership role is advocated as the means to an effective discharge of the responsibilities. The academic dean as leader will be able to define the institution's mission, translate the mission into organizational actions, defend the institution's integrity, and also achieve an ordering of internal conflict.

It is recognized that a central concern of the dean should be the question of excellence in teaching and the problem of rewarding undergraduate teaching at institutions organized primarily for the purpose of research. Failure of faculty to prepare stimulating classroom lectures, an indifference to the results of teaching, and an increasing social distance between teachers and students are matters that merit special attention by the dean. Wicke recommends that the dean become actively involved with major faculty committees on academic policy where curriculum practices can be studied and evaluated carefully and where recommendations for innovation can be formulated.

Although a leadership role is advocated for the dean and the ability to command the respect of the faculty deemed crucial, Wicke emphasizes that the dean has only a limited authority to deal with academic problems: "A dean is not even a *little* president; he is at best a student-administrant. . . ." The dean is not an indispensable person and should not attempt to do too much on his/her own. On the other hand, the dean must not yield to the temptation to retreat to routines that are unrelated to the basic responsibilities of the office or to cease being a teacher and a student in his/her own way.

¹Myron F. Wicke, "Deans: Men in the Middle," *The Study of Academic Administration*, pp. 53-70, edited by Terry F. Lunsford (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963).

The Dean of Students or of Student Affairs¹

Evans discusses the dean of students and some of the special problems that the occupant of the position faces. According to Evans, working *in* academia does not necessarily permit one to be *of* academia. The kinds of problems routinely dealt with by the dean's office—mental illness, discipline, and distraught parents—are matters that most academic administrators and faculty members are happy to avoid. Business administrators also appreciate the dean's supervisory presence over students in view of the increasing number of lawsuits which are filed against colleges and universities. Yet, while student personnel functions generally are recognized as valid by the faculties and administrators, the dean of students is not accepted as a full partner in the academic enterprise. The dean of students must be able to live with the fact that he/she may not be highly valued by his/her associates.

The dean of students should believe that good counseling and constructive leadership do make a difference in the lives of students and the institution. The dean should be committed to helping the student develop a healthy self-image and the dean should present evidence to justify the support of student personnel services. Evans believes that demonstrating accountability (defined in terms of articulating job objectives, setting measurable goals, and evaluating whether reasonable progress toward the goals is being met) is not beyond the capacity of the dean of students, although when quantitative data is inappropriate, other evidence should be admissible. The successful dean of students, then, is one who realistically appraises the services provided through his/her office.

The chief talent of the dean is skill as a human relations specialist and he/she derives satisfaction from the personal contact with students that is an essential component of the job. The dean also displays an experimental outlook, which includes the willingness to implement student and faculty suggestions and to initiate changes on his/her own that might prove to be beneficial. In addition to human relations skills, the dean of students maintains competence in some academic specialty, whether it be psychology, statistical analysis, history, art, or music. Involvement in an academic department is viewed as an important way to avoid the image and self-image of bystander on the campus scene.

¹Byron F. Evans, "There Will Always Be a Deandom," *NASPA Journal* 11 (Spring 1974): 2-5.

²The concept of the position of Dean of Students makes the titles, Vice-President, Student Personnel, or Student Affairs equally appropriate. A review of other writing related to this position broadly suggests that the person who holds it also shares responsibility with other academic administrators for creation of a total student learning environment and may be evaluated for his/her contribution to that environment.

Literature Review and Bibliography

There is a literature on evaluation in education. The bulk of it relates to the evaluation of student aptitudes, abilities, or interest and to achievement in a variety of performance and cognitive areas. There is a lesser literature that aims formally to evaluate ability, skill, and performance of teachers in directing learning. There is only a most modest literature relating to the tasks performed by administrators, especially for academic administrators, including presidents.

The literature review regarding administration and administrative evaluation for the purpose of this paper has had its foundations in such pioneering books as Barnard's *The Functions of the Executive* and Simon's *Administrative Behavior*. The Selznick volume, *Leadership in Administration*, has been particularly useful. Kerr's *The Uses of the University* has a rather explicit statement concerning the functions of the president. Perkins' *The University in Transition* is infused with observations and insights related to the work of the academic administrator. Three noted former presidents have written on the presidency, making specific use of their own experience in deriving important insights related to the office. They are Wriston (*Academic Procession*), Dodds (*The Academic President—Education or Caretaker?*) and Stoke (*The American College President*). McVey and Hughes have written a delightful book touching on many of the seemingly minor but nonetheless significant facets of presidential performance and demeanor. Gould has written on the office of the academic dean, but the literature on academic administrators other than the president is also limited.

One who would understand academe and presidential roles can profitably read some of the academic novels. C. P. Snow's *The Masters* is powerful in helping one to understand the political facets and the nature of power as it relates to a college's leadership. Mary McCarthy's *Groves of Academe* is a study in academic politics in novel form and of the administrative demise of an "innocent" president. Baker, a Princeton professor, has written the interesting *A Friend in Power*. The number of novels with an academic setting runs into the hundreds.

The scholarly literature concerning the presidency and the roles of academic administrators is limited. Bolman's *How College Presidents Are Chosen* and Kauffman's *The Selection of College and University Presidents* are currently the most relevant to evaluation, although their focus is on evaluation prior to appointment rather than evaluation of presidential performance. The most useful book in describing and analyzing administrative roles

would seem to be the recently revised edition of Corson's *The Governance of Colleges and Universities*. Studies such as Clark's *The Open Door College* and Baldrige's *Academic Governance and Power and Conflict in the University* are important to achieving a scholarly understanding of academic leadership.

The studies of Cohen and March reported in *Leadership and Ambiguity* are fundamental to valid evaluation of the performance of academic administrators. Cohen and March have established the concept that there are varieties of presidential roles. They also substantiate the situational character of administrative behavior and the idiosyncrasy of much informal evaluation and employment or dismissal decision making. The analysis of Munitz and associates as they reviewed the work of Cohen and March added substantially in its complementary and contradictory material to Cohen and March's concepts of presidential role.

The substance of this monograph relating to the definition and description of the evaluation as process and of the substance of the evaluation is in part derived from the relevant literature noted above. It also represents the experiences of the writer as observer and participant (administrator) since 1938, the considerable input of the three presidents in the Pennsylvania State College and University system who form the Presidents' Personnel Committee, and the associated staff of the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The writer also has shared in the observations made by Penn State academic administrators and the insights of his colleagues in the Center for the Study of Higher Education.

The bibliography which follows is directed more to an understanding of presidential and other academic administrative roles than to the technology of evaluation. We believe this is as it should be in considering the task at hand as dealt with in this monograph.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris. *Executive Leadership: An Appraisal of a Manager in Action*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1967.
- Auburn, Norman P. "The University President—Mission Impossible?" *Educational Record* 52 (Spring 1971): 146-51.
- Baker, Carlos. *A Friend in Power*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- Baldrige, J. Victor. *Academic Governance*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- . *Power and Conflict in the University*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.
- Barnard, Chester I. *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Bennis, Warren G. *The Learning Ivory Tower*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Bolman, Frederick deW. *How College Presidents Are Chosen*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.
- Clark, Burton R. *The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed, & Swarthmore*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.
- Cohen, Michael D., and March, James G. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Corson, J. J. *Governance of Colleges and Universities*. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Cummings, Edgar C. "When is a College President Successful?" *School and Society* 81 (March 5, 1955): 65-67.
- Dodds, Harold W. *The Academic President—Educator or Caretaker?* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Drucker, Peter F. *The Effective Executive*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Ferrari, Michael R. *Profiles of American College Presidents*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1970.
- Gould, John Wesley. *The Academic Deanship*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.
- Heady, Ferrel. "The Role of the President Today." *Public Administration Review* 30 (March/April 1970): 117-22.
- Hesburg, Theodore M. "Presidential Leadership." *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (December 1971): 763-65.
- Hyde, Robert M. "The Presidential Search: Chore or Opportunity?" *Educational Record* 50 (Spring 1969): 186-88.
- Kaplowitz, Richard A. *Selecting Academic Administrators: The Search Committee*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.
- Kauffman, Joseph F. *The Selection of College and University Presidents*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974.
- Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University—with a Postscript 1972*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Knox, Warren Barr. *Eye of the Hurricane*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1973.
- McCarthy, Mary T. *The Groves of Academe*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952.
- McKenna, David L. "Recycling College Presidents." *Liberal Education* 58 (December 1972): 456-63.
- McVey, Frank Le Rond, and Hughes, Raymond M. *Problems of College and University Administration*. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1952.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. "Emerging Concepts of the Presidency." *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (May 1971): 353-67.

- Ness, Frederic W. *An Uncertain Glory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Neustadt, Richard E. *Presidential Power*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1960.
- Perkins, James A. *The University in Transition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Prator, Ralph. *The College President*. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.
- Remmers, H. H., and Hobson, R. L. *The Purdue Rating Scale for Administrators and Executives*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Book Store, 1951.
- Setznick, Philip. *Leadership in Administration*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, & Co., 1957.
- Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947.
- . "The Job of a College President." *Educational Record* 48 (Winter 1967): 68-78.
- Snow, C. P. *The Masters*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Stoke, Harold W. *The American College President*. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Wells, Herman B. "How to Succeed as a University President Without Really Trying." *Educational Record* 45 (Summer 1969): 241-45.
- Wiggin, Gladys A. "Selecting and Appraising Personnel." *Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education*, pp. 129-48, edited by Harold Benjamin. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- Wriston, Henry M. *Academic Procession: Reflections of a College President*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.