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„The 'stuff' of performance assessment can easily become a tail that wags the dog, rather than a means to strengthen leadership, governance, and management and provide greater stability. For performance assessment to work, the approach must be **reasonably simple in design and implementation, yet it must yield substantive results**. The process should be as low key as possible and sensitive to the fact that the academic presidency continues to be one of the most complex jobs in the nation“.

Quelle: Tom Ingram and Bill Weary, Association of Governing Boards, Washington, D. C.
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Erfolgskriterien für Hochschulmanager

• Strategisches Management
• Finanzierung
• Organisation und Leitung
• Personalmanagement
• Internationalisierung
• Qualitätsmanagement
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Independent membership service since 1993

Comprehensive evaluation conducted by a team of experienced European higher education leaders

The intention is for these evaluations to support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture

250 evaluations have been conducted in 39 countries in Europe and worldwide

- Germany: FH Erfurt, Katholische Universität Eichstätt, FH Münster, Universität Bayreuth, Universität Bremen, Universität Siegen

http://www.eua.be/events/iep/home/
Its methodology (audit) consists of:

- A self-evaluation report by the university, requiring an assessment based on a SWOT analysis; answering four key questions
- Two site visits by an evaluation team
- A report written by the team
- At the request of universities, a follow-up visit can take place two years after the initial evaluation.
Institutional Evaluation Programme:
Four key questions (1)

What is the institution trying to do?
• Missions, aims and objectives (5-10 years) and their appropriateness and how the university sees itself locally, nationally and internationally

How is the institution trying to do it?
• University leadership and decision-making structures, bodies and strategies
• Relationship between central and decentralized entities (university leadership, e.g. represented by the Rector’s Office or Senate vs. Faculties and Departments)
• Division of functions between Faculties (teaching) and Departments (research)
• Commissions and committees
• Participation and interest groups (“stakeholders”)
Institutional Evaluation Programme: Four key questions (2)

How does the institution know it works?
- Feedback systems in place, in particular quality assurance mechanisms; quality control or quality monitoring; quality management
- Central control instruments (PI, MIS)
- Non-monetary data (drop-out rates, average study duration, whereabouts of graduates, service performance, etc.)

How does the institution change in order to improve?
- Strategic Planning and the Capacity and Willingness to Change
- Strategic Challenges (the process of Europeanisation, the decline in state funding, demographic development, etc.)
- Staff development (in the areas of general, resource, staff and quality management; strategic planning; use of new media, etc.)
Übersicht

Award „Hochschulmanager des Jahres“ der Financial Times Deutschland und des CHE (14. 11. 2008, Berlin)

Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) der European University Association (EUA)

Presidential & Board Assessment in U. S. Higher Education

Evaluation der Leitung der Universität Zürich im Jahr 2003
U. S. Association of Governing Boards –
A Systematic Program of Presidential and Board Performance Assessment

- The Chief Executive
  (Annually)

- The Governing Board
  (Every three to four years)

- The Chief Executive and Governing Board
  (Every five to ten years)

Illustrative Interview Questions: The Presidency and Management (1)

Institutional Agenda
- How has the institution progressed during the president’s period of service?
- Are any major institutional priorities being neglected?

Academic Leadership
- How has the institution’s academic standing advanced since the incumbent began the presidency?

General Management and Planning
- How would you describe the way institutional planning is conducted?
- What can you point to as laudable achievements in the institution’s infrastructure, staffing, and information systems?

Fiscal Management and Budgeting

• Has the president helped the larger community to understand the institution’s financial condition?
• Has there been success in meeting budgets and containing costs?
• Reallocating resources?

Fund-Raising

• What successes illustrate the president’s ability to raise private dollars from individuals, corporations, and foundations?
• Are donations from alumni steady, increasing, or decreasing?

Internal Relationships

• With which internal groups has the president been particularly effective and ineffective, and why?

External Relationships

• With which external groups has the president been particularly effective and ineffective, and why?

Illustrative Interview Questions: The Presidency and Management (3)

Decision Making and Problem Solving

• Please describe the president’s leadership style.
• To what extent does he or she delegate decisions when appropriate?
• How would you gauge the president’s ability to cope in crisis situations?
• Can the president make difficult decisions in timely ways?

Other Perspectives

• Reflecting on the president’s years of service, what major achievements or shortcomings come in mind?
• What is the most important thing the president can do to strengthen his or her effectiveness?

Ausgewählte Evaluationsprojekte:

- Award „Hochschulmanager des Jahres“ der Financial Times Deutschland und des CHE (14. 11. 2008, Berlin)

- Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) der European University Association (EUA)

- Presidential & Board Assessment in U. S. Higher Education

- Evaluation der Leitung der Universität Zürich im Jahr 2003
Themen der Evaluation der Universitätsleitung UZH 2003

Führung
- Organisation der Universitätsleitung (UL)
- Operative Führung
- Berufungen / Betreuung der Professorenschaft
- Zusammenarbeit der UL mit ausseruniversitären Gremien
- PR der Universität / Aussenauftritt
- Instrumente der Qualitätssicherung
- Zukünftige Entwicklung

Finanzen
- Verfügbare Ressourcen
- Universitätsinterne Ressourcensteuerung und –verteilung
- Verbreiterung der Finanzierungsbasis
- Risikomanagement
- Finanzkontrolle

Umsetzung der Universitätsreform
Ablauf der Evaluation

**Evaluierte Einheit**
- Selbstevaluationsbericht
- Befragungen
  - Mitarbeitende
  - Kunden
  - Externe Stakeholder
- Erhebungen
- Experten (Peers)
  - Site-Visit
  - Experten-Bericht
- Stellungnahmen

**Evaluationsstelle**
- Befragungen
- Erhebungen
- Stellungnahmen
- Gesamt-evaluationsbericht

**Follow-up**
- Memorandum of understanding / Zielvereinbarung / Massnahmenprogramm

**Monitoring** (nach zwei Jahren)

Massnahmen aufgrund der Evaluation der Universitätsleitung UZH 2003

Strategische Ziele (Universitätsrat und Universitätsleitung)
Internationalisierung (Universitätsrat, Leitbild)
Reorganisation der Universitätsleitung
Delegierte Kommunikation
(Reorganisation der Abteilung Kommunikation)
Harmonisierung der Ausstattung bei Berufungen
Interne Revision
Struktur der Universitätsleitung und -verwaltung 2004
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