

- a. **Purpose.** A dean is appointed by the provost on a year-to-year basis subject to the will of the president or the president's designee. The provost conducts an annual review of the dean. At intervals no longer than every five years, a dean will undergo a comprehensive review of his or her performance. This administrative assessment should serve at least the following objectives:
- (1) enhanced administrative performance;
 - (2) increased professional development;
 - (3) improved accountability to appropriate constituencies; and
 - (4) greater communication across all levels of the university about program goals and their implementation.

Because deans are appointed to an indefinite term, periodic multi-year reviews ensure a consultative role for faculty in the decision whether to continue a dean in office.

- b. **Timing.** A multi-year review of a dean will occur, whenever possible, at the same time that the multi-year review of the college occurs. Thus, reviews of deans will be coordinated with collegiate reviews under II-28.2.

The review process should ordinarily be completed within one semester following gathering of appropriate information.

- c. **Responsibility.** The Office of the Provost initiates collegiate reviews and will therefore also be responsible for initiating the review of the dean.
- d. **Scope.** The decanal review assesses the effectiveness of the dean's leadership and management of the college. The review should include the following elements:
- (1) An examination of the elements used in the provost's annual review of deans:
 - (a) sponsored research applications and income data;
 - (b) number and value of private and corporate gifts received;
 - (c) diversity of faculty, staff, and students;
 - (d) student enrollment trends;
 - (e) student selectivity and quality;
 - (f) student performance on outcomes measures;
 - (g) interdisciplinary and international initiatives;
 - (h) faculty productivity (teaching, publications, grants, etc.);
 - (i) service to Iowa;
 - (j) personal development and accomplishment; and
 - (k) budget management.
 - (2) A review of the college's strategic plan and the college's progress toward meeting the targets associated with its strategic planning indicators.
 - (3) Results obtained from questionnaires sent to faculty, staff, students, involved alumni, and advisory council members in order to ascertain the dean's overall leadership, effectiveness, quality of communication with

internal and external constituents, consultation with faculty, and governance. The provost will provide a set of core questions to select from, and a small set of mandatory questions. The review committee and the dean may include any number of additional questions at their discretion. Questionnaires sent to constituent groups may differ. The review committee may also meet with the college's elected executive committee, faculty, staff, students, or other constituent groups.

- (4) A review of the dean's choices for associate and assistant deans and the overall functioning of the collegiate administration.

- e. **Dean's Self-Assessment.** The dean will prepare and submit to the review committee, by a date to be determined by the provost, a self-assessment of no more than ten single-spaced pages.
- f. **Review committee.** The provost will solicit names of potential committee members from the college's executive committee, the Faculty Senate, and collegiate faculty, in accordance with collegiate procedures. The provost will vet the proposed membership with the dean. The committee should include three to five faculty and one staff member from within the college, one faculty member external to the college, one dean from another college to serve *ex officio*, and an external consultant. The provost will appoint a chair.

The review committee will consider the dean's self-assessment, the strategic plan and indicators of annual progress, and all of the elements included in the scope of the review. The committee should conduct any meetings or interviews using a focused site visit format not to exceed three to five days.

- g. **Review Report.** By the last day of classes in the semester in which the review began, the review committee will submit to the provost a final report generally not to exceed ten single-spaced pages. This report will become part of the dean's personnel file.

The provost will meet with the dean to review the final report. The dean may provide a written response following that meeting.

The provost will then meet with faculty in the college to discuss the recommendations and substance of the review. The dean may participate in the provost's meeting with faculty or not, according to collegiate procedure. The provost may also, in consultation with the review committee, convey the substance and recommendations of the review to appropriate constituencies other than faculty.

- h. **Supervisor Assessment of Administrative Service.** The final step of the decanal review will be an explicit written affirmation by the provost that continued service by the dean would be in the best interests of the university. Such an affirmation may be unconditional, or may be conditioned on changes in subsequent performance or on the receipt of a positive assessment under a future supplementary review. The provost should consult with the president regarding guidelines for the handling of instances in which no affirmation is possible, or in which the provost believes some significant improvement in performance is necessary.

Each constituency consulted in connection with the review of the dean will receive appropriate and timely notification of the provost's affirmation of the dean, or lack thereof.

- i. **Supplementary Reviews.** Although it is advantageous to coordinate formal multi-year evaluations of deans with collegiate reviews, supplementary reviews may occur when requested by the dean, the collegiate faculty, or the provost.
- j. **Procedural Variation.** The provost may consider and approve departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, where the provost and the faculty agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of the review, or under other special circumstances.