TO: Charles McCann
FROM: The Task Force on the Evaluation of Administration
SUBJECT: "What's Good for the Goose..."

The evaluation of administrators at Evergreen should be a pleasure rather than a punishment. Its primary purpose should be to provide support for the kind of creative, flexible, and humane administration that Evergreen must have in order to insure a steady improvement in teaching by our faculty and learning by our students.

We believe that our students should learn to evaluate and judge themselves and their work intelligently, critically, and courageously. This is a part of becoming adult, free, and human. We believe that the faculty must continue to grow in this fashion too and that the administrators at Evergreen can hardly be expected to participate effectively and do their work effectively and creatively unless they too are learning to evaluate themselves. A college pledged to the liberation of the mind, to the cultivation of the free and responsible individual cannot be expected to succeed if its administrators, its president, vice presidents, deans, and directors march to a different drum. We want a college that is a community of learners, one in which the administrators as well as the teachers and the students are learning to be self-aware, self-reliant, and open to information from all those whose lives they touch and influence.

The administrators we are concerned with in this document are the president, the
vice presidents, and the deans and directors who report directly to one of the vice presidents. While we believe that everyone at Evergreen should be caught up in a process of growth through self-study, our recommendations to you are limited to the evaluation of these administrators only. We recommend that the three vice presidents, their directors and deans develop appropriate systems of evaluation for those reporting to them. These systems should be consistent with the general principles stated in this report.

One final general point. Most institutions of higher learning make little or no provision for the learning of the art of academic administration. It is an art that cannot be learned in an army, a business, or a church. The art of administration at an innovative college can hardly be learned and refined at a conventional college. Evergreen must provide its administrators (directors, deans, and vice presidents) with unusual opportunities to learn a new art, to experiment with new administrative attitudes, styles, and procedures. A unique college will require a unique administration, as well as a unique faculty and curriculum. It will require a unique interest in itself, an overwhelming commitment to self-study and self-evaluation.

Given our assumptions, here is our proposal:

(1) That the president now precisely specify the college's goals, objectives, and priorities. Self-evaluation cannot occur unless there is something against which performance can be measured.

(2) That the president ask the three vice presidents to formulate and coordinate the goals, objectives, and priorities of their separate but equal fiefdoms.

(3) That the three vice presidents be required to participate, with the president and their deans and directors, in a continuous process of self-study and mutual aid, and that this be the evaluation process of Evergreen's administrators.
(4) That this continuous process of self-study be incidental to occasional decisions about contract renewals and salary increases, but that such occasional decisions always be based upon self-study and never on secret surveillance.

(5) That two of the vehicles for continuous self-study be a portfolio kept by the administrator about himself and a regular seminar, the subject of which will be the general principles and problems of higher education in America today and the specific principles and problems of higher education and academic administration at Evergreen.

(6) That administrative service at Evergreen require commitment to growth through learning, growth through self-study, and that this means the keeping of a portfolio about himself and participation in a seminar about Evergreen.

(7) That the specific criteria of growth and the specific causes for notice or reprimand be developed by each vice president and his directors and deans for his own fief.

(8) That there never be a campus-wide set of criteria or causes, or a super snooper evaluator reporting to anyone, be he vice president, president, or trustee.

(9) That the vice presidents and their administrators insist on an open and non-secretive process of self-evaluation.

(10) That suggestions for the content of and accessibility to the portfolio, and the nature of the seminar be the responsibility of each vice president and his directors and deans. Input from students and fellow staff must be encouraged.

(11) That the self-evaluation criteria and system developed by the faculty and academic deans be taken as an example only. The other vice presidents and other administrators might wish to experiment in a variety of directions because
special criteria and procedures must be developed for those who do special tasks, and this at the level where the work is being done.

(12) That administrators not be given limited terms of office. Retention should be based upon the recommendation of those with whom the administrator is actively associated if justified by the process of self-study, which should show growth with Evergreen and support of Evergreen.

(13) That merit pay increases be made upon the recommendation of the administrator's vice president if justified by the process of self-study and mutual aid.

(14) That administrators herein defined shall have access to the same adjudicative procedure described in the faculty document on Academic Freedom and Faculty Responsibility.

We want to state emphatically that if Evergreen is going to insist on new and better ways of learning and teaching, then it must insist on new and better ways of academic administration. Well designed curricula and a carefully recruited faculty will come to nothing unless we can help each other discover and perfect better ways of operating this college.

Moreover, we want to emphasize our commitment to the principle of real autonomy, the real decentralization of power, authority, and responsibility. The president must delegate real responsibility and he must insist that his vice presidents delegate real power and responsibility in turn. This process must not stop with directors and deans. They in turn must delegate. If we treat anyone as a flunky we do not belong at Evergreen. He who wishes to keep a factotum at his beck and call should be embarrassed to be here.

It is in this spirit that we recommend rigorous self-evaluation by a free man rather than sneaky surveillance by a supervisor. This is why we recommend
freedom for the vice presidents to develop and experiment with their own unique adaptations of the Evergreen ideal.

"The unexamined life is not worth living — even for an administrator."
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5/24/71
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles McCann
FROM: Merv Cadwallader, Chairman
SUBJECT: Disappearing Task Force on Evaluation of Administration

Our Task Force took the assignment you gave us very seriously indeed. Our careful and fruitful deliberations revealed agreement on the following principles:

1. The entire Evergreen community needs to hear and work toward goals clearly specified by the President of the College.

2. Voluntary and continued self-evaluation based upon open and honest communication is a necessary condition for growth by students, faculty, and administrators.

3. That the Evergreen community cannot be half open and half closed, half free and half slave.

4. That an example must be set by the President and the Vice Presidents of Evergreen, if self-evaluation is to become a reality.

5. That any procedural recommendations should leave enormous leeway for variety of applications in the different sectors of the campus.

We are proud of our report and the speed with which we put it together. We think our recommendations deserve a serious effort at implementation. We believe that the system will work if the President and Vice Presidents at Evergreen take it seriously, do it themselves, and demand that others try to follow their heroic example.

The Task Force ended its work on May 20th and, true to its name, disappeared.

MEMBERS OF THE DTF

David Carnahan
Rick Fitchitt
David Hitchens
Richard Nichols

Donald Parry
Mabel Whitney
Al Wiedemann
Kenneth Winkley
Mervyn Cadwallader, Chairman

MLC:ej
cc: David Barry
Joe Shoben
Dean Clabaugh
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles McCann
FROM: Merv Cadwallader
SUBJECT: Administrative Evaluation

I asked Byron Youtz to say something about our report. Here is what he said:

In the opinion of some of the members of the COG who were consulted (Aldridge, Youtz and others), a clear and enforceable set of procedures for administrative evaluation is absolutely central and essential to the acceptance and workability of the plan for College Governance being proposed. It appears that the ultimate official vehicle available to the campus community to assure input into administrative decisions will be through the administrative evaluation procedures. It is through this device that the community can express itself most constructively on the question of adequate consultation before decisions are made. Without a smoothly functioning procedure encouraging evaluative contributions from a wide circle of community opinion, the students and faculty will undoubtedly invent their own (probably less constructive) ways of expressing their frustrations.

It is imperative, therefore, that you, the President, express your expectations on the breadth of input into the administrative portfolios rather forcefully to the Vice Presidents, and that they, in turn, express their expectations equally forcefully to the Deans and Directors who serve under them.

MLC:jvk
I. Purpose

The purpose of evaluation is self-improvement. It is recognized that any growth or improvement can only be measured over time and that an individual can only respond to suggestions and constructive criticism by showing improvement over a period of time. Growth and change, or lack of these, can only be evidenced by using time as the base reference. In these terms then, it follows that the more frequently an individual is evaluated or evaluates himself, the easier it is to recognize growth and improvement. Frequent evaluation also facilitates reviewing of any employee's job description and performance, keeping description and performance in concurrence, or proving that an employee has expanded his performance beyond the bounds of description. Evaluation, as an on-going process, is a way of giving us the "strokes" we all need, followed by suggestions as to how we might earn more.

II. Use

The evaluation may be used for: (a) promotion; (b) documenting current performance; (c) maintaining job security.

A. Promotion

1. Civil Service. Under civil service law, promotion must be based on competition. The evaluation will be the documented record of an employee's assuming added responsibilities, expanded knowledge of his job, self-growth and improvement. Coupled with civil service requirements, an evaluation portfolio will be an additional tool for a supervisor in making selections for promotion.

2. Administrative exempt. Administrative exempt personnel are employed by the deans with no written regulations governing promotion and dismissal. It is recommended that the evaluation be the documented record used when considering exempt personnel for promotion and dismissal.

B. Documenting current performance.

1. The evaluation will be documented record of an employee's job performance.

C. Maintaining job security.
1. Civil Service

For all Civil Service employees, dismissal must be in accordance with JEPB rules. The evaluation allows any employee to learn of his shortcomings; and, as an evaluation measures growth over time, this recommended evaluation process gives adequate and reasonable time for an employee to improve. Therefore, the evaluation will be the documented record used by an employee to show continuing competence and/or improvements.

2. Administrative Exempt

As stated above under II, A, 2, there are no written regulations governing the dismissal of exempt personnel. Again, it is recommended that the evaluation be the documented record used by an exempt employee to avoid dismissal through proof of improvement over time.

In all but an unusual or emergency situation, no employee, classified or exempt, shall be dismissed from duties until it has been shown that he has failed to improve over a period of time. "Time" for all employees shall be six months from the first recorded and documented indication of needed improvement.

III. When

No formalized evaluation method can take the place of a timely word-praiseworthy or critical. If someone is doing a good job, for Heaven's sake, tell him so! When someone appears to be floundering in dangerous, uncharted or disagreeable waters, stick out a needed hand or foot to help. Do it on the spot. Evaluation is a continuous process, and it is the intent of these recommendations not only to encourage a more regular and formalized method of evaluation, but also to urge that the more frequently we each receive feedback, (Payroll, cheery words, smiles, etc.), the smoother our jobs will go. It seems risky, at the least, to stockpile complaints and then commence firing at some appointed time. Formalized evaluation must not inhibit on-going evaluation. It must not be used as a screen to hide behind. Lists of complaints and pent-up feelings do not contribute to an atmosphere that is positive and open. The greater the frequency of use, the more effective the system. Realizing the tendency of most humans to avoid unpleasantness and the difficulty which most have in handling criticism (giving and receiving it), it is hoped that in scheduling evaluations, these problems can be eased. It is recommended that a mini-evaluation occur every three months, and that an annual summary evaluation occur in July. The time for the "mini" and summer evaluations is to be considered sacred time set aside for evaluation only.
IV. How

A. Supervisors will initially announce evaluation periods. Both employees and supervisors will then be equally responsible for setting mutually agreeable times and places for the evaluation conferences.

B. Mini-evaluation conference.

The three mini-evaluation conferences will occur in October, January and April. They should be 15-30 minutes in length, or however long/short desired. The employee is to choose the method of documenting the mini-evaluation conference, i.e. the conference can be documented by taking notes at the time, or by tape recording. However the meeting is chronicled, it is strongly recommended that it be done at the time. Memory tends to fade, fog and color under the press of work.

C. Summary conference - July

This conference is to be based on three mini meetings. It will, at the least, consist of a one-to-one conference between the employee and the supervisor. The conference will be documented in the manner chosen by the person being evaluated, and fully supported by appropriate library resources. As the person being evaluated, you may choose to:

a. Write a self-evaluation, to be discussed with your supervisor.

b. Request that your supervisor write an evaluation of you prior to the conference. This will be discussed at your evaluation conference. (This choice obligates the employee to write an evaluation of the supervisor if the supervisor desires it.)

c. Request that other people contribute evaluations of you to be discussed at the evaluation conference.

d. Request that other people attend and participate in the evaluation conference.

e. Have the oral evaluation conference tape recorded and the tape remain as documentation.

f. Have notes made at the time of the evaluation conference.
It has been recommended that definite scheduled times be set aside as "sacred" time solely for the purpose of the evaluation conference. Along with this, we recommend that a sacred place be agreed upon by those concerned. The work area is not conducive to contemplative discussion, however brief. The evaluation should be held in a location where the parties concerned will not be interrupted.

V. Storage and access.

Each employee keeps and maintains his own evaluation file. A supervisor will have access to the file upon consent of the employee. All other requests for access to that file must come through the employee's supervisor. A supervisor or anyone else may contribute to the file at any time.

VI. Who

All library employees are urged to participate in the evaluation process: part time; student employees; civil service people; and administrative exempt.
MEMORANDUM

To: President's Council

From: Dave Barry

Subject: Administrative Evaluation

Vice President Shaben's paper, October 11, 1971, was a welcome analysis and commentary on approaches to evaluation of administrators. It was important not only for how it addressed itself to what as yet remains a future question but because (as I read it at least) it most usefully reviewed the climate and tone of past and present administrative practices that have allowed Evergreen to set down first definitions of program format in all areas; to bring faculty, students and staff together in attempting to fulfill on the statement of mission for The Evergreen State College as a place dedicated to placing people (students all--) in contact with on-and-off-campus sources of knowledge, and to assist them to become active learners, responsible for development of personal talents and resources toward self-fulfillment as well as social responsibility and leadership in a troubled and rapidly changing world.

I fully agree that these goals even when simply stated as above "remain so abstract and general that they admit of congenial interpretations by those who practice not only different but conflicting life styles." Experience to date verifies Joe's anticipation of "fairly severe hassles in the course of attaching relatively precise meanings to these thoroughly laudable concepts." The specific question which Joe presents is "whether all those fights will really be necessary and productive." I raise the further question of whether all the doubt and uncertainty, and ambiguity (and if not "fights" then at least the resultant confusion and disunity) that we have struggled through was also "really necessary and productive." I for one despite my willingness to admit a "special sociology of new institutions," am reluctant to believe that it was necessary.

I am satisfied that it was limiting, consuming, and that it distracted most persons from contributing at levels of experience, talent and productivity of which they were capable. It appears to me that all agree that the future leaves no room for repetition of the form of at least some of the experiences of the past year.

Looking to the future it is so task to identify many forces that have the potential for turning the Evergreen Program around and for re-institution of past academic patterns; this even before present programs are in operation long enough to have their first fair pass at evaluation. This could be accomplished simply through reduction of "formula resources." It could be accomplished simply by impressing standardized approaches that tie unit costs and faculty work loads to credit hour indices. Imagination can readily generate other forces and specters as well.
On review of efforts on other campuses across the country, the Evergreen Program still stands as one of the most soundly conceived. Our first efforts at implementation look most promising. This reflects credit for "all hands" but at the same time it's important to keep in mind that credits are ephemeral.

Evergreen remains a fragile entity. We have yet to reach a level of administrative and program coherence and continuity that will assure that thoughtful review and evaluation will constitute the basis for future modification and change. We can be caught "dead in the water" as a result of special pressures from within or without. For this reason a whole series of questions on administrative organization, areas of initiative and responsibility, delegation and coordination, accountability and locatability, etc., need continual review. The problems are complex and the two DTF's on Administrative Evaluation have served their functions well in formulating first thoughts.

To parallel the trend of Joe's October 11 memo, I'm not sure what the May 26 DTF had in mind other than periodic reporting from the President on the "State of the College" as that "State" pertains to attainment of goals, to fiscal problems, to community relationships, both internal and external, to provide continual guidance and persuasion toward our "basic purposes and objectives." Joe's point in this paragraph deserves full support and consideration. "Keeping alterations---keyed to our main target, etc.----" is indeed a "central task of leadership" as defined by the DTF Report and there is none who can substitute for the President in this role.

There are several areas which need additional exploration. I agree that "students should learn to evaluate and judge themselves and their work intelligently, critically, and courageously." This principle applies equally to faculty and administration. The corollary of the principle which remains unexplored is how self-evaluation and evaluation of other sorts become fitted together. Self-evaluation, to have meaning within any defined community assumes a frame of societal reference to which the individual can and must relate. I assume the first level of our frame of reference is the total community of Evergreen and our general goals as the President has stated them.

In a separate paper I have defined what I consider to be the basic elements of "community" in a public institution. I include the students, the faculty, the administration and staff, the trustees who ultimately represent the public at large. Each element bears a responsibility to each and all the other elements; a responsibility which requires consideration beyond levels of individual self-evaluation. A humane responsive and open system of checks and balances in evaluation is a requisite to assure that self-evaluation does not evolve through stages of self-assertion to self-righteousness and even "repressive tolerance" by any of the elements that I have described. This sequence is a familiar one in the history of human institutions in general and campuses in particular. Self-evaluation is an important step in the process but it is only a beginning. I hold this view as equally true whether applied to students, faculty and administration or trustees.
It is in this inclusive sense of evaluation that I share Joe's concern on Page 2, paragraph 4, when he poses the question "When both power and responsibility have been delegated, what remains to the person who has delegated them?" There is only one answer. One can delegate power to act along lines of authority, responsibility for actions taken remains shared by the delegating element or office and all echelons of organization. The trustees as well as everyone else have struggled with this question. It is in this context that it has been accepted that persons in administrative office at Evergreen serve by appointment from an office of more general responsibilities, which office is responsible to assure that the process of positive self-evaluation is pursued by the person appointed and as well that guidance and suggestions are provided to the appointed persons toward the goal of self-improvement in the administrative role.

Joe reaches to the heart of this problem of relationships in his first paragraph on page 3. "One asks a great deal of a colleague to be self-revealing about the characteristics of himself and his performance that could hurt him." Something is asked which transcends the immediate community commitments of the Evergreen Environment. Something is asked which is almost existential in character which does not adequately deal with the changing character of individual human relationships and commitments. Human beings are fragile and not fully predictable. At the simplest level, even the physiology of being human is constantly changing and not readily predictable.

Several of the items of the DTF of May 24 speaks negatively to the question of secrecy. I concur. However, only item 10 of this report addresses the question raised by Joe concerning the psychological hurt which can occur by "openly accounting for dismissals, failures of retention, withheld increments in salary, etc." In item 10 the DTF does state that "the content of the accessibility to the portfolio--" be the responsibility of each Vice President and his directors and deans with input from students and fellow staff to be encouraged.

The meaning even in item 10 is not clear. The whole question of the portfolio remains an unknown. It is my first conclusion that if a portfolio is to include records of self-evaluation and guidance given for later review etc. the accessibility of that portfolio must be settled to the satisfaction of the two principal parties who are involved, the appointing officer and the person appointed. Professional evaluation in the administrative role has a somewhat different base than it does for faculty and student performance. The roles are not readily interchangeable. This position seems to be in accord with the DTF report July 14, page 2, last paragraph where they would add the President as a 3rd party.

I have difficulty in separating the multiplicity of "portfolios" generated by an administrator through his daily record of actions taken or not taken. They speak to his intent, his mode of action, and his responsiveness in defining problems and drawing persons together toward their solution. They can and I believe should constitute his major base of self-evaluation. Suggestions from peers and the associative groups with which he works constitute a more specific source of materials that would not be redundant if placed in a portfolio and this could be explored and added to, guidance given by the appointing officer. However, even here it is important to
keep in mind that what is considered as suggestion or guidance by one person may well be viewed as unwarranted criticism and/or administrative interference by another; again the subtle balance of relationships between delegation and coordination must be better understood and accepted by all. The July 14th Report is helpful on this point.

The Administrative Seminar sounds like a worthy enterprise until one begins to develop a "tally" of the number of seminars which could be enforced upon persons in certain roles. I find resolution for this by viewing all administrative planning sessions as basically seminars in which the wisdom of the group is to be sought and brought to bear upon analysis and solution of problems of higher education in general and in particular as they pertain to Evergreen. It has been my experience to date that people are so busy that there are empty seats even now at meetings previously agreed upon as essential for campus governance and program development. The work load is understandable but I see nothing in the circumstances that would assure that an additional series of administrative seminars would prove to be much more attractive. The present desire expressed by both faculty and students is for large rather than small group meetings for discussion of general problems and interests.

I do not have before me a copy of the charge Vice President Clabaugh gave to the DTF on Evaluation of Administrators (see report July 14, 1971) but am impressed with how they carried the work of the first group forward into specifics. They appear to me to have identified elements of relationships that could serve as a model for all program areas. Insofar as they obviously committed significant amounts of time and effort, I urge that we look first to their report and consider its implications before we initiate any new process.

Throughout the discussions on evaluation there has been consistent reference to words attributed to Socrates that "the unexamined life is not worth living." I'm sure all support the principle. However, until we clarify the context and criteria for examination, determine what shall be the mode of examination and what its goal shall be, we have not met the responsibility implied in acceptance of the principle. An "unexamined" approach to either "examination or evaluation" would be without direction or meaning. A life based on such approaches would also be "not worth living." The unfinished task is in the implementation of the principle.
To Presidents Council

From Dave Barry

Subject---------Continuation of Analysis of Relationships re: memo of 11/29/71.

CHANGING PATTERNS AND APPROACHES TO EVALUATION

If relationships between administrative organization and administrative functions were simple it would be simple to design approaches and necessary forms to perform an evaluation process. However, the relationships involve a complex and evolving balance of relationships rooted in technical expertise and sensitivity to human needs and understandings. Not everyone is equally successful in all areas of administrative enterprise. It is for this reason that preliminary positive approaches to evaluation at Evergreen for students, faculty, administration and all staff hold much promise. The challenge is to identify and encourage strengths, and to identify areas of potential and to assist in their development as well.

Evergreen has initiated an academic and general campus program whose flexible responsive character reflects the changing needs of the larger society. A quotation from Warren Bennis on the nature of social change is a useful reference point:

"The old...is based on an old-fashioned scarcity-oriented, technological culture. The amorphous counter-culture that is growing to challenge it might be considered a person-centered culture...the old culture...has moral components which are authoritarian, puritanical, punitive, fundamentalist. When forced to choose it tends to give preference to property over personal rights, technological requirements over human needs, competition over cooperation, violence over sexuality, concentration over distribution, producer over consumer, means over ends, secrecy over openness, social forms over personal expression, striving over gratification, loyalty over truth. The new person-centered culture tends to reverse all these priorities." (Arribismo. The Research Reporter, 1970, 2(3)

The Evergreen academic program has been designed with sensitivity for the nature of these changes. The administrative program must follow in phase. Because of the pervasive nature of these changes, I contend that there are certain principles of administrative relationships that should be examined for their possible applicability to all areas of administration across the campus. Administrators
face two basic areas of responsibility: They must produce results within areas of technical competency and they must attain these results within a climate of inter-personal relationships that bring these associative groups and persons who will be affected by decisions into the planning process early on; this to assure their understanding of the parameters and constraints and to draw upon their experience in search for the most appropriate decision. Ideally that decision would be devoted toward the welfare of the human condition of all involved and as well be technically sound but in that order.

In this context I am defining principles which I believe underlie administrative leadership in all campus areas.

Planning—essentially a staff (includes faculty and all others) function. Administrative leadership sets forth goals and purposes—staff analysis and action (the Evergreen DTF's) determines the reality of the potential for fulfillment of these goals and purposes within the means (dollars, facilities, etc.) and human talents available.

Decision—this is essentially an administrative function and involves acceptance of responsibility and accountability for deciding on a course of action from among the alternatives generated by staff counsel. Ideally, consultative interplay and exchange among staff and administrative elements will result in an early sorting of the potentials and priorities in such a manner that the most attainable and supportable shared decision is the result. This is the "art of the possible" and lies at the heart of the success or failure of the Disappearing Task Force approach we have followed to generate consultative staff input for the decision-making process at Evergreen. This in contrast to the more authoritarian approach of another day defined by Bennis.
Implementation——this is essentially an administrative function which follows from the decision making process leading to agreed upon administrative policy. It calls for allocation of resources, for statement of policies, guidelines and delegation of responsibilities and identification of the locatable and accountable points necessary to the implementation of the decision. Staff cooperation in implementation pre-supposes understanding of both process and goal. If these circumstances prevail, little additional administrative involvement is needed save when unforeseen problems require review and re-adjustment.

Coordination——is primarily an administrative function and to be successful requires that staff operations routinely generate informational input to enable the administrator to be assured that agreements that led to decisions are being fulfilled and that phasing of relationships among all staff elements remain directed toward agreed upon goals. At the same time, such informational flow will enable identification of problems and provide for reconsideration and new planning for implementation and operations if original plans and considerations prove unattainable or undesirable.

It is my judgment that these principles of administrative responsibility can and should be applied to all administrative offices no matter where they are. To do so requires that each officer have a clear understanding of what the mission of his office is and what his authorities and responsibilities are.

To accomplish these goals each officer must have a clear understanding of how the various offices of the organization inter-relate, one with the other and within some pattern which supports the general corporate mission of the institution from which the various breakout of authorities and responsibilities is derived. Only within such a pattern of images can effective delegation be accomplished. As I see it, delegation is the conferring of specified responsibility, initiative and authority from an office of general responsibility.
to an office of more specialized responsibilities. The one to whom the authority is delegated accepts the responsibility for "doing the job" whatever it may be but the general office still remains responsible for assisting in getting the job done. This to me is administrative accountability to the purposes of the organization and can not be delegated. Delegation means that the accountability is shared.

Delegation and sharing of accountability are not simple relationships. What is delegated must be made very clear. This usually can be accomplished by job description in areas where "line" delegation is more likely the pattern. It becomes more difficult in areas where there is overlap and continual creative interplay among offices involved in flexible program development. The communication needs remain much the same. Every effort must be made to make the delegation clear, the sharing of accountability must be understood, and a system of "feed-back" or reporting relationships is essential. The office or person who has accepted the delegated responsibility is responsible for "doing the job." The office or person that delegated the "doing of the job" remains responsible and accountable for "seeing that the job is being done." If patterns of delegation are diffuse, then patterns of accountability will be diffuse and persons interfacing with the "system" will be frustrated because they will not be able to identify who, or what office is "locatable and accountable" for a particular decision or action or where and how to place their questions. Under such circumstances organizational conflict arises and success in fulfillment of the corporate purposes of the organization will be limited and frustrated, if not aborted.

Under such circumstances attempts at coordination will be viewed as "undue interference" and will be resisted. To succeed in coordination, offices or
persons of general responsibility must be able to bring various peer elements together to assure that where elements are out of phase with general mission, that adjustments can be made in accord with its mission or to change the mission which may be what is needed.

Planning, deciding, implementing and coordination and evaluation operations should be vested functions of all offices and the administrators should be "evaluated" and assisted to grow in accomplishing these functions in areas previously defined as technical expertise and in the inter-personal dimensions of human relationships.

Evergreen as a new institution is attempting to find administrative forms that will fit the corporate purposes of the institution which are set down in the President's Statement of Mission. We have devised some innovative forms. The patterns of relationships which I have described continue to evolve and this is why I argue that we must not only evaluate administrators but continually evaluate administrative organization and program as well. Only in this way can we be assured that delegation of initiative is being accomplished and that it is also contributing to fulfillment of the institutional mission.

I am continuing to struggle with specifics for implementation of administrative evaluation on these principles.

cc:  Academic Deans
     Director of Cooperative Education
     Faculty Liaison Committee
TO: Dave Barry
FROM: Mervyn Cadwallader
RE: The Evaluation of Academic Administrators

THE PECULIAR ROLES OF THE EVERGREEN DEANS

If all of the fundamental components of the Evergreen curriculum—coordinated studies, contracted studies, and self-paced learning, are to form some kind of a coherent whole with a focus, with balance, and with a characteristic gestalt that gives the whole college a unique cast of its own, then the deans must have enough real de facto power, authority, and responsibility to make the necessary operational decisions to keep it together, to keep it going, and to keep it solvent. They will have to be able to judge proposals, evaluate reports, and allocate funds. They will have to be able to locate and nominate faculty, reward and dismiss faculty. They will have to be able to orient and aid faculty and to interpret and reinterpret the Evergreen commitment to a liberal education to the old and new faculty. The president and the provost must insist that the deans do that kind of work. They must have the power, authority, and responsibility that kind of work requires.

The deans have the reciprocal obligation, vis-à-vis the faculty, of providing the power and authority that will make the assignment of responsibility and the demand for accountability meaningful. The deans will have to assume a heavy obligation to explain and interpret, to help and assist, to facilitate and coordinate. The faculty will be trying to arrange and organize the students' environment so as to encourage as much learning and as much human
development as possible. That is the art of teaching. The deans will be trying to arrange and organize the faculty's environment so as to encourage as much successful teaching as possible. That is to be the art of creative academic administration at Evergreen.

Here is a list of the operational decisions the deans of Evergreen must have the de facto power to make without prior approval:

1. Prepare the academic budget
2. Review and approve programs, obligate funds, allocate and assign faculty position to programs
3. Recruit, interview, and recommend faculty appointments
4. Appoint coordinators, assign faculty to programs
5. Give approval for equipment, travel, and overseas field project requests
6. Formulate evaluation criteria for reappointment, salary increases, and program continuation
7. Coordinate student evaluation, credit, and grading policies.
8. Coordinate faculty reassignments, space assignments
9. Coordinate college self-study research
10. Make reappointment, and salary increase recommendations
11. Appoint ad hoc study groups as needed
12. Plan all college festivals and ceremonials
13. Prepare annual all-college, self-study reports
14. Assist in writing college catalog

We have to keep in mind the importance of locating the making of certain operational de facto decisions in the deans' office, followed by a review in the provost's office and then by the president. The final de jure responsibility for Evergreen's budget, faculty appointments, reap-
pointments, and curriculum rests with the president. If the deans make serious mistakes, the president and the provost can and should hold them accountable. But they have to have the real freedom and power to make those mistakes before they can be held accountable for anything. Let me give a specific example: if the president does not delegate the authority and power to spend money to the deans, the provost cannot hold the deans accountable. If the deans do not delegate the authority and power to the faculty teams to spend money, they cannot be held accountable.

Let me make one more point that is very much on my mind as I try to learn the fine and difficult art of creative academic administration at Evergreen. If a dean, or a provost, or a president actually insists on prior approval before a decision is made, there has been no delegation of power, authority, and responsibility. Work may have been spread to flunkies down the line, but not the opportunity to think and work creatively. None of us like to take risks, none of us like to be surprised, but the creative administration and wise government of Evergreen will require an unusual willingness on the part of the president, provost, deans, and coordinators to cope with high levels of ambiguity and to cope with more surprises than is our custom. Fortunately, if we find a good faculty and give it an unusual degree of freedom to act creatively, and trust them, most of the surprises will be pleasant.

Here is a summary of my general argument for creative administration at Evergreen: Each team determines its own material, its own needs, designs its own program, makes up its own schedules, conducts its own experiments in curriculum design and teaching, evaluates its own effectiveness. The team asks for a mandate and gets it. The team asks for a budget, and for students, and gets both. It is up to the team to use its resources, its
energy, and its mandate to do something memorable and something significant.

The deans will be on constant call to aid in every way possible the creative and critical work of the faculty. They will assist and question. They will support and judge.

THE EVALUATION OF THE DEANS

The process of evaluation that is to characterize all of Evergreen has two basic components:

(1) Continuous self-evaluation, and

(2) Periodic conversation about the results of this self-evaluation between the individual and those responsible to him and those to whom he is responsible.

In the case of the deans, this means that each of us will keep some kind of an active portfolio into which we will place materials about the work we have done and how well or how poorly the work was done. It will be our responsibility to keep our own autobiographies, to ask our own searching questions, to solicit the comments and criticism that we must have if we are to do good work, if we are going to be creative and critical.

Periodically (at least once each quarter) the academic deans should set aside a day for a very open and honest "encounter" with each other in which they tell each other how well or poorly they think they are doing and ask each other how well or poorly they think they are doing and ask each other how well or how poorly they are actually doing. If the provost is interested in how he is doing, he could participate in those "encounters".

The process of keeping the portfolio coupled with periodic encounters will provide all of the evidence anyone could possibly need in trying to
answer the question of whether or not the deans have lived up to their creative and critical charge. This will be true whether or not the person asking the question is a student, a member of the faculty, a dean, a provost or a president. The individual most concerned and most involved in the process will be the individual carrying out the self-evaluation, the individual reflecting on what he has done, the individual searching for ways to assist rather than hinder, to clarify rather than confuse, and to inspire rather than inhibit.

The deans now know their duties; the deans are determined to do an outstanding job; and above all else the deans are determined to keep asking themselves and others how are they doing.
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