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New Policy and Procedure Concerning Periodic Review of Deans

Submitted by Fred Smith

4/8/2014

Motion:

Add the following to the Faculty Handbook as the second paragraph in section 104.03: Periodic Review of Deans

Deans shall undergo a comprehensive performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum of 30% of the college’s voting membership (as defined in Article 1, Section 3, of the University’s Statutes – Corps of Instruction). In the fifth year of a dean’s tenure, and shortly after the fifth annual evaluation, the Provost shall conduct the performance review.

The performance review will include examination of all responsibilities of the position of dean. The review portfolio will contain at a minimum: the dean’s curriculum vitae, summary of the dean’s accomplishments over the last five years, the dean’s goals for the upcoming five years, the college faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the dean, and the Provost’s annual evaluations of the dean.

Faculty, staff, and department chairs of the college, and peer deans will be surveyed separately. A copy of the dean's review portfolio will be provided for members of the college to read prior to their participation in the survey. The Provost will also seek input from the Office of University Advancement concerning the dean’s fundraising efforts.
At the conclusion of the review, the Provost will provide faculty of the college a written report summarizing the performance review. In addition to the Provost’s comments, the report will describe, in general terms, faculty sentiment toward the dean’s performance. The Provost will meet with interested faculty to discuss the report. A separate meeting will be similarly held for department chairs.

**Rationale:**

After the approval of last year's five year review of department chairs, the Faculty Welfare Committee asked Provost Bartels for permission to begin work on a similar review for chairs. She agreed, but pointed out that because of the much broader duties of a dean, there would be similarities but also substantial differences in the dean review process.

The Faculty Welfare Committee worked in close collaboration with the Provost on this project. The FWC members believe the review begins with the kind of broad review the Provost expects while including ample input from faculty on the types of dean responsibilities of most concern to faculty. There is separate input from chairs and staff of the college.

At the conclusion of the appraisal there is transparency in that the Provost will include both in writing and in meetings the outcomes of the process.

**Response:**

Minutes: 4/22/2014: “New Policy and Procedure Concerning Periodic Review of Deans” (motion passed) Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Yes, I’m learning as I go, Robert. Okay, the title would be Periodic Review of Deans. And I would like to move that this be inserted as the second paragraph in section 104.03: “Deans shall undergo a comprehensive performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum of 30% of the college’s voting membership (as defined in Article 1, Section 3, of the University’s Statutes – Corps of Instruction).
In the fifth year of a dean’s tenure, and shortly after the fifth annual evaluation, the Provost shall conduct the performance review. The performance review will include examination of all responsibilities of the position of dean. The review portfolio will contain at a minimum: the dean’s curriculum vitae, summary of the dean’s accomplishments over the last five years, the dean’s goals for the upcoming five years, the college faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the dean, and the Provost’s annual evaluations of the dean. Faculty, staff, and department chairs of the college, and peer deans will be surveyed separately.

A copy of the dean's review portfolio will be provided for members of the college to read prior to their participation in the survey. The Provost will also seek input from the Office of University Advancement concerning the dean’s fundraising efforts. At the conclusion of the review, the Provost will provide faculty of the college a written report summarizing the performance review. In addition to the Provost’s comments, the report will describe, in general terms, faculty sentiment toward the dean’s performance. The Provost will meet with interested faculty to discuss the report. A separate meeting will be similarly held for department chairs.”

Bob Cook (CEIT) Senate Parliamentarian: The portfolio says it includes the Provost's evaluation, and the evaluation of the Dean, by the Chairs, but then it says the whole package is available to faculty was that the intent? That the Provost’s evaluation would be available to, if it is part of the portfolio and it says the portfolio is available to faculty then

Jean Bartels (Provost): If I understand, it would be the annual reviews of the Provost would be included in the portfolio. Bob Cook (CEIT) Senate Parliamentarian: It says the Provost’s annual evaluation of the Dean would be part of the portfolio, and then it goes on to say that the portfolio in total would be available to the faculty. So I just wanted to make, I didn’t know whether that was confidential or whether, I wanted to make sure that the intent was that that would be public.

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Much of the language was adapted but taken for this motion from last year’s chair review and I am pretty sure that was pretty much just adjusted slightly but the intent I believe was that the previous annual reviews from the Provost would be included for the faculty’s examination. But now if that’s not clear I suppose we could change it here.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: I think it's clear. I think it was a question of whether those should be made available or whether that would be a
breach of some kind of privacy. Jean Bartels (Provost): I’m happy to take them out, if
you’d like. Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: I think it’s
great, too. Any other, June you had a comment.

June Joyner (CLASS): Does the five-year period, does that begin on permanent
appointment or would it include interim time, when that is applicable? Jean Bartels
(Provost): On permanent appointment.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay, so these are for
permanent appointments, not interim appointments. Any other comments on this? Rob
Pirro.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): So, if you have an interim Dean, would there be a review that would
be transparent and available to the faculty and other stakeholders? Jean Bartels
(Provost): There are annual reviews done for interim; they could be included, I would
guess in the document, but actually the timing for the document is five-years after
permanent appointment.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I just want to emphasize, I think that maybe it’s a little bit of a shock
at how transparent it seems this process is going to be, and I think that people on the
committee were committed to the idea of transparency that, you know, that faculty and
other stakeholders are able to assess and understand the performance of a Dean and
how that is evaluated by the Provost. So I’m very much in favor of this transparency.
And one other thing I want to note is in our discussions at the committee level, this
faculty survey instrument that the faculty will be filling out their view of the Dean’s
performance, my understanding is and Fred can correct me if I am wrong, the last
question will be do you believe this Dean should be kept on, essentially yes or no. A yes
or no question on whether the faculty member believes this Dean should be continued
as Dean and I mean, is that right, Fred?

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Yes, the last question is very close
to that. Rob Pirro (CLASS): And if I could just go on one more thing. And I think it’s
important that when the Provost makes his or her report to the faculty, that we hear
what the faculty think about a Dean’s performance and that would be one question that
we want to hear the results about. And, and my sense, I mean, having gone through
some turmoil in CLASS a few years ago over a Dean’s performance or evaluations of a
Dean’s performance, I can say that this, the fact that we also have this early, we have
this option if we get 30% of the colleges’ voting membership to ask and request we will
get an early evaluation, that’s critical and I think that that gives us a way an organized
ordered way of calling attention to a case where we think that there are some problems with the Dean’s leadership and they should be looked at in a systematic way.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay, thank you. If there’s no further, is there further, any other comments that anyone would like to make. If there’s no further comments,

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Just one more acknowledgment of course the committee worked long and hard on this. The Faculty Welfare Committee and their, all the members are to be commended. We got off to a wrong start. We, our first attempt was to establish a review committee and we after some work on that we were told by Provost Bartels that she didn’t want a review committee, but anyway in addition to, as Rob mentioned, much help and collaboration and generally faculty friendly input from the Provost to put this thing into the Qualtrics to make it actually possible to administer it, an angel named Valerie Kasay in CATS, I wanted to make sure that she’s acknowledged, too, because without her help it would still just be sort of sitting there.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So, thank you, Fred. The question then is the approval, the question then is on the motion regarding what is the title of this motion, is it up there? The Review of, Periodic Review of College Deans, okay all in favor of approving this motion please say aye? Those opposed? So the motion passes. Okay, thank you so much for the committee, to the committee for all this work and to the Provost for helping it along. The, so we are now at #8 on the list, which is, sorry, Provost Bartels. Jean Bartels (Provost): Just to assure you that this is for real, we will be conducting our first Dean’s review this very summer with Dr. Bede Mitchell, who is at the five-year point.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay. So here we go. The, is that, Dr. Bartels, even if this is not in the Handbook, yet, can we get going on it?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Once it is approved, I really believe it should be implemented and we’re at a point where we could do that and given the nature of the Deanship this one would work. It will give us an opportunity to test it as well. So I think it is important.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay. Thank you.