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Chapter 28 – Academic Review
(President, upon recommendation of the Faculty Senate, 1981; amended 1986, 1988, 1989, 1990, 2/16/93, Board of Regents 2/7/95; 2/07; 10/09)
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28.1 General Purpose
(Amended xxx)

The fundamental role of the academic review process is to aid the University community in its continual striving for excellence and efficiency in its teaching and research through systematic review of its performance and direction on every level -- from that of departments and programs, through colleges, and ultimately to the University as a whole. The specific purposes of the review process include the following:

a. to identify and reassess missions and goals;
b. to examine functions in terms of quality and continuing need;
c. to establish priorities for programmatic development;
d. to evaluate the effectiveness with which program activities promote the welfare of faculty, staff, and students;
e. to review the financial structure with regard to sources of funds and amounts required to support essential goals and objectives;
f. to establish a base for future development; and
g. to evaluate progress in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The benefits to be derived from academic reviews are varied and relate to all levels of the University. The process of preparing a self-assessment in itself can lead to new insights concerning functions, problems, needs, and future directions on the part of the academic unit or program. Service on review committees broadens the perspectives of faculty concerning the missions and interrelationships of departments, programs and colleges.
within the University. These academic reviews allow faculty to have direct input on recommendations for improvements in academic administrative structure and function. These activities facilitate productive communication between faculty, shared governance, and university administration. The results of reviews can provide one basis for determining departmental, collegiate, and University priorities for program development and resource allocation. Finally, the review system represents the fundamental component of the University’s long-range planning process through which the Board of Regents will assess the future needs and development of the institution. In sum, the academic review process plays a critical role in maintaining institutional vitality, planning, and improving the quality of our programs, facilities, staff, students, faculty, and administration. Therefore, the Executive Vice President and Provost will report annually to the Faculty Senate on the results of academic reviews, stressing the implications of reviews for planning at the University level.

The following policies and guidelines are meant to emphasize the need for clearly defining the various components of the review process and the procedures to be followed so as to make this process more widely understood and effective. In addition, these policies focus on the importance of a full consideration of the recommendations resulting from the review. Colleges are responsible for regular reviews of their departments and academic programs. Collegiate reviews of departments and programs should follow the policies and guidelines in this chapter.

Except for reviews of administrators for whom the President is responsible, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall have overall responsibility for monitoring the implementation of this section.

28.2 Collegiate Review
(Amended xxx)

a. Purpose. Systematic collegiate review should assist the faculty, dean, and University administration in 1) evaluating how effectively the college is achieving its educational goals; 2) identifying the college's strengths and weaknesses; and 3) developing strategic plans and priorities for future directions of the college. Pertinent information collected for the purpose of answering specific questions about the college's various components and activities will provide a firm foundation for evaluating the college.

Review, particularly of a small college, need not be long and complex. It should concentrate on essentials. A collegiate review has two parts — 1) a self-study of the college and its programs by the collegiate faculty and administration; and 2) a peer review by University faculty members from outside the college in collaboration with one to two reviewers external to the University.

b. Timing. Reviews of colleges shall take place at least once every seven years and ordinarily not more frequently than once every five years. Where possible within these time constraints, reviews should be coordinated with external accreditation evaluations. Reviews may also be scheduled within these parameters to coordinate with other specific circumstances, e.g., a pending change in collegiate leadership or an impending significant change in resource needs. It is anticipated that the process of review will take a full year.

c. Responsibility.. In order to assure that the review can benefit from evaluation and planning, the timing of the review process will be decided through consultation between the Provost and the Dean of the college. Collegiate reviews are initiated by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, and that office organizes and directs the process and formulates the final conclusions. The Office of the Vice President for Research and the Dean of the Graduate College also will be involved in
those matters germane to their areas of responsibility, e.g., scholarly and creative activities, graduate studies, developing programs.

d. Scope. The Executive Vice President and Provost will determine the scope of the evaluation.

(1) In General. The collegiate review should represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the college’s function, with recognition of the mutual dependency of programs and activities. An able student body, a faculty engaged in effective teaching and scholarship, effective performance of staff members, effective collegiate administration, and adequate facilities all contribute to the success of a college and must be reviewed as a whole.

Although all collegiate reviews are to be comprehensive, the focus will vary from college to college. It is not intended that collegiate reviews duplicate the specific evaluations of programs provided through departmental or program reviews (see II-28.3(1) below). In departmentalized colleges, the results of departmental or program reviews during the preceding seven-year cycle will serve as one source for review of the college. In such cases, the collegiate review will focus primarily on evaluations of college-wide programs, policies, organization, funding, etc. In non-departmentalized colleges, in which departmental/program reviews have not been conducted (with the possible exception of some graduate programs), the collegiate review will involve a more in-depth evaluation of each specific program in the college.

(2) Areas to Be Considered:

(a) Collegiate Mission and Goals: The overall mission and goals of the college and their contribution to the University mission.

(b) Strategic Plan. The suitability of the collegiate strategic plan and progress toward achieving plan goals.

(c) Students. Historical and prospective student enrollment over a seven-year period, admissions policies and procedures, quality, advising, governance, placement services, student perceptions of the college, its program, faculty, and administration.

(d) Educational Programs. Instructional programs of the college in regard to:

(i) the learning objectives of the program;

(ii) curriculum content in relation to the learning objectives of the program;

(iii) student achievement of learning objectives of the program;

(iv) program changes since last review and success of changes in relation to program learning objectives;

(v) recommendations for program changes based on recent assessments and other pertinent data;

(vi) the relation of the program to the goals of the college;
(vii) the continuing need for the program;

(viii) the overall quality of the program; and

(ix) the interaction of faculty and students with other parts of the University (e.g., development of and participation in interdisciplinary programs).

(e) Scholarly and Creative Activities. The scope and excellence of scholarly and creative activities and their contribution to instruction. "Scholarly and creative activities" are meant to include "research" whether or not it is in the laboratory.

(f) Service. Programs or individual efforts that provide services to the college, University, state, nation, or others; the contribution of service activities to instructional, scholarly, and creative activities.

(g) Faculty. Assessment of the faculty teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative contributions, and service.

(h) Facilities and Support Services. The adequacy of space and support facilities such as library, research space, staff assistance, instructional aids, and equipment and supplies.

(i) Collegiate operations.
   
   (i) organizational structure of the college, including committees, communication among faculty, staff, students, and dean; adequacy of the structure for discharging regular collegiate responsibilities.

   (ii) role of faculty, staff, students, and administration in collegiate affairs and the nature of their interaction.

   (iii) relationship of the college to the University community, the alumni, peer institutions and other affiliations.

   (iv) effectiveness of collegiate strategic planning and plan implementation processes.

(j) Financial Resources. The financial structure of the college should be reviewed on a program-by-program basis with regard to source and amount of support and in terms of educational, scholarly, and creative activity and service objectives.

e. Self-Study Committee. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall initiate the collegiate self-study by requesting the college to organize a representative self-study committee. The self-study committee shall be organized in accordance with procedures adopted by the collegiate faculty at least one (1) year prior to the year in which the self-study is to occur. Procedures adopted by the collegiate faculty shall be approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost. These procedures shall set forth the size and qualifications for membership on the self-study committee and shall include the method by which members of the self-study committee shall be selected. They shall also provide for what role, if any, the dean of the college shall play in the selection of the self-study committee.

The self-study committee is charged with developing the collegiate self-study with the cooperation of the dean, collegiate faculty, staff, and other members of the University community, as the committee
The self-study committee has the responsibility for organizing and conducting the self-study in relation to the review topics listed in this policy. The self-study committee will conduct the review to ensure broad consultation with the faculty, students, staff, and administration of the college and, if deemed appropriate by the self-study committee, with external constituents of the college.

Copies of the self-study report shall be forwarded to the dean and faculty of the college for their review and comment. Thereafter, and following such other endorsements as may be required by collegiate rule, final copies, revised if appropriate, shall be forwarded to the dean of the college and to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. The final self-study shall be made available to the public.

f. Self-Study.

(1) General. The college should re-examine its goals and reflect on how various activities contribute to the achievement of those goals and identify priorities and directions for the future. The self-study should address the major areas described in II.28.2.d(2) above.

(2) Data. Much of the data needed for the self-study can be obtained from the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, the collegiate administration, and often from recent accreditation materials.

g. Self-Study Reports. The committee will prepare a report that includes information and data on which the self-study was based, and the conclusions reached about the strengths, weaknesses, and future directions of the college. Particular attention should be given to ways in which improvements in programs and functions can be achieved within currently available or, if indicated, reduced collegiate resources. Sources of flexibility for resource reallocation should be identified in the self-study.

h. Review Procedures.

(1) Based on the collegiate self-study, the Executive Vice President and Provost will develop a charge for the review in consultation with the dean and the self-study committee.

(2) Peer review of the college will be accomplished by a review committee composed of University faculty and staff from outside the college in collaboration with one to two reviewers external to the University appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost in consultation with the dean of the college. The reviewers external to the institution should be at appropriate rank and/or position to participate in the review.

(a) The review committee will meet with the Executive Vice President and Provost to be given the charge for the review, plan the specific steps to be taken, and establish a tentative timetable for the review.

(b) The review committee shall consider the self-study and related documents and interview faculty, staff, students, and administration of the college under review. It will ascertain the relationships of the college to other academic units in the University, evaluate its programs, and come to some conclusions about appropriateness of goals and the degree to which these have been attained. It will help identify strengths and weaknesses of the college and will make recommendations concerning possible improvements and future directions in the college.
(c) The review committee will prepare a report on its findings and conclusions and will submit a preliminary draft of the report to the Executive Vice President and Provost to ensure that the charge has been addressed. The review report shall not contain confidential personnel information concerning the collegiate dean or other personnel. The Executive Vice President and Provost will submit the review committee’s draft report to the collegiate dean and self-study committee so that errors of fact and problems with wording may be identified and corrected. The college will submit the corrected draft review report to the Executive Vice President and Provost, who will finalize the report in consultation with the review committee as needed.

(3) Consideration and Implementation of the Review Report. The Executive Vice President and Provost will submit the final review report along with recommendations to the college based on the review. Copies of the review report will be made available to students, staff and faculty in the college and, upon request, to others. In general, the following steps will occur:

(a) The dean and self-study committee shall consult with college faculty and may respond in writing to the review findings and recommendations. Such responses, if any, will become part of the total review report.

(b) The Executive Vice President and Provost will submit a final closing letter summarizing the review and the steps to be taken by the college and the Provost to address the recommendations in the review. These steps and recommendations will be submitted to the President.

(c) When the college's strategic plan is next updated, the internal recommendations resulting from the review should be incorporated into the college's strategic plan.

i. Procedural Variation. The Executive Vice President and Provost will consider and may approve departures from these procedures in the case of specific reviews, where the Executive Vice President and Provost and the college agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of collegiate review.

28.3 Review of Departments, Programs, and Personnel

28.3(1) Departmental/Program Review

(Amended xxx)

a. Purpose. For the purpose of this section the term “department” shall refer to any and all groups within colleges that undergo independent review. This can include programs that exist outside of departments and function independently. Systematic departmental review should assist the faculty, dean, and University administration in

(1) evaluating how effectively the department is achieving its educational goals;

(2) identifying the department's strengths and weaknesses; and

(3) developing strategic plans and priorities for future directions of the department.

b. Components. A departmental review has two parts:

(1) a self-study of the department and its programs by the departmental faculty and administration; and
(2) a peer review by University faculty members from outside the department and usually two consultants external to the University.

Pertinent information collected for the purpose of answering specific questions about the department's various components and activities will provide a foundation for evaluating the department.

c. Timing. Review of a specific department shall be conducted at least every seven years. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall establish a schedule for review of departments or programs within the college. Variations from the schedule may be justified for a review to occur before or after the usual period due to specific circumstances, e.g., a pending change in departmental leadership, specific problems that arise or the desirability of coordinating a review with an external accreditation evaluation.

d. Responsibility. The Executive Vice President and Provost has the responsibility for establishing general policy and procedural guidelines for departmental reviews. Within these general guidelines, the faculty of each college has the primary responsibility for establishing specific policies and procedures for departmental reviews. The collegiate dean has the responsibility to conduct such reviews in accord with these policies and procedures. However, when graduate programs are involved, the specific college and the Graduate College share these responsibilities. In such cases, integrated procedures and guidelines for joint review of undergraduate and graduate programs in a unit are to be established.

e. Scope. Reviews should represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of a department.

(1) In departmentalized colleges, the basic review unit is the individual department, school, or division, except as noted in subparagraph (b) below. Each such unit shall be reviewed as a whole with the review covering all undergraduate and graduate instructional programs that are the responsibility of the unit as well as the scholarly and creative activity and service programs of the unit.

(2) In instances where instructional programs do not correspond with departments, schools, or divisions (e.g., interdisciplinary programs), such programs will be reviewed separately, except that undergraduate and graduate programs are to be reviewed jointly whenever feasible.

(3) In non-departmentalized colleges, the undergraduate or professional instructional program of the college shall be reviewed as part of the collegiate review process. Reviews of graduate programs within non-departmentalized colleges also may be incorporated into the overall collegiate review, or the collegiate dean and dean of the Graduate College may jointly establish a separate schedule of reviews for such programs.

(4) Areas to Be Considered. The college shall define the areas to be considered in reviews (e.g., mission, goals and strategic plan, students, faculty, educational programs, scholarly and creative activities, service programs, facilities, support services, departmental administration, and financial resources). Factors to be evaluated and questions to be answered should be specified in each area.

Department reviews will take into consideration the same areas as those outlined in the guidelines for Collegiate Reviews II-28.2(d)(2). The reviews should focus on specific areas and questions that are most relevant to the particular department. These areas and questions should be specified by the college prior to each review in consultation with the department. As a result, the exact focus of the self-study and review will vary among departments.
f. Review Procedures.

1 Self-Study Committee. The dean will direct the Departmental Executive Officer (DEO) in consultation with the departmental faculty to determine the makeup of the departmental or program self-study committee and the process for preparing the self-study report. The self-study committee shall be organized in accordance with procedures adopted by the collegiate faculty setting forth the size and qualifications for membership on the departmental or program self-study committee, including the method by which members of the self-study committee shall be selected.

2 Self-Study: The first step in the review process is the self-study to be carried out by the department or program faculty. The college(s) will establish specific guidelines to aid the department or program in preparing the self-study, including any required standardized data formats. These guidelines should ensure that the self-study:

(a) is evaluative, not solely descriptive, and identifies priorities and directions for the future;

(b) is carried out in consultation with faculty, staff, students and other appropriate groups;

(c) considers those quantitative data, including future enrollment projections, that are needed to provide an adequate description and evaluation of current and future status of the department;

(d) is made available to all departmental faculty for their input or comment, prior to its being edited in a final form; and

(e) in final form shall be available for public dissemination. It will be made available to the department’s faculty and to the external review committee members prior to the external review. Ordinarily, the self-study will achieve these goals by addressing the major areas described in paragraph e (2) above.

1) External Review. The review process will involve review by an external committee. Collegiate procedures regarding the external review may differ, but the following principles apply to all collegiate departmental and program reviews:

(a) Committee members may not be members of reviewed department;

(b) There will be at least two reviewers external to the University, unless the Executive Vice President and Provost approves a smaller number for good cause, such as the size of the unit reviewed;

(c) External reviewers will either participate as active members of a single review committee or they will submit their own separate written report;

(d) The committee will be advised that the review report shall not contain confidential personnel information concerning the DEO or other unit personnel.

2) Consideration of Report and Administrative Response. The collegiate dean(s) in consultation with the department or program, shall consider and respond to review reports.

3) Dissemination of Review Reports and Administrative Response. The external review committee
will submit its report to the collegiate dean(s), who will deliver it to the Executive Vice President and Provost and to the unit or program, along with any written response from the unit or program.

(a) Either the review reports or their substance shall be made available to departmental faculty and staff and, on request, to others.

(b) The dean, in consultation with the dean of the Graduate College when the unit offers a graduate degree, prepares a final letter summarizing findings of the review and setting out recommendations and required remedial actions. The dean communicates this final letter to the DEO and the unit's faculty, as well as to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

3<br>Procedural Variations. The dean shall consider and may seek approval from the Executive Vice President and Provost for departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, where the dean and the unit or program faculty agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of the review.

28.3(2) Multi-Year Reviews of Departmental Executive Officers (DEOs) and Program Directors<br>(2/07; 10/09 Amended xxx)

a. Purpose. These reviews serve two primary purposes: 1) they provide an occasion for deans to evaluate personnel in charge of programs and departments; and 2) they permit a systematic faculty evaluation of department and program leadership. These reviews may occur within the context of a departmental/program review, but it is not required.

b. Timing. The timing of reviews of DEOs and program directors shall be established by collegiate rule but shall occur no later than the fifth year following initial appointment. Following the initial reappointment, subsequent reviews of DEOs and program directors shall occur at least every five years and always prior to the reappointment decision.

c. Responsibility. The collegiate dean, in consultation with the faculty and subject to approval by the Provost, has the responsibility to establish publicly available written policies and procedures for reviews of DEOs and program directors. The collegiate dean further has the responsibility to conduct these reviews in accordance with such policies and procedures.

d. Scope. Reviews should cover the following areas, recognizing that circumstances of the unit led by the DEO or program director may alter the areas in which a DEO or program director is evaluated:

   (1) Strategic plan. The DEO or program director should take a leadership role in formulating a strategic plan for the unit, reflecting awareness of educational and professional trends, and should consult with members of the unit in the process of doing so. Plans should be agreed upon with the reviewing authority at the beginning of the review period and integrated into the collegiate strategic plan. To what degree does the DEO or program director meet the strategic plan objectives?

   (2) Professional development. How effective is the DEO or program director in stimulating programs aimed at professional development of faculty and staff? Does the DEO or program director regularly and effectively stimulate discussion while encouraging and guiding promising
developments through to implementation?

(3) Quality of personnel policies. Is the DEO or program director actively participating in the recruitment of high-quality individuals? Are they concerned with enhancing faculty effectiveness in accordance with a clear principle of merit? Does the DEO or program director consistently and effectively apply principles and policies of equal employment opportunity to recruitment? Are they advancing and evaluating faculty and staff? Do they promote and support professional development to enhance the performance of the department or program?

(4) Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The DEO or program director is responsible for promoting excellence in education by increasing the diversity, equity, and inclusion of faculty, staff, and students. This individual is also accountable for making progress in diversity, equity, and inclusion in the areas of recruitment, mission(s), retention and climate. How effective is the DEO or program director with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion in their department or program?

(5) Education. How effective is the DEO or program director in stimulating discussion of new ideas and encouraging and guiding promising instructional developments through to implementation? Have they provided an environment within the unit and between the unit and other parts of the University that enhances the educational efforts of faculty and students? Does the DEO or program director establish a professional and civil educational environment?

(6) Scholarship. Does the DEO or program director encourage and recognize scholarship among the faculty, and create an environment that fosters and encourages scholarly pursuits?

(7) Resource management. DEOs and program directors should actively advocate for resources adequate to enable the unit to achieve its full academic potential and strategic plan. Are resources sufficient and allocated appropriately?

(8) Civility and professionalism. Does the DEO or program director establish and enhance good working relationships with faculty, staff, students, external constituencies, and others with whom they regularly interact?

(9) Consultative governance. Is the DEO or program director providing opportunities for consultation through individual and group meetings? Do they provide appropriate information in a timely, full, and open manner to facilitate effective participation in planning and policymaking?

(10) Reappointment. The review should invite faculty members to recommend for or against reappointment to the central administrative officer or dean position.

e. Review report. The report is considered a confidential personnel record. Some aspects of the review must be disclosed, however. The DEO or program director being reviewed shall receive the results of the review and shall have an opportunity to respond to them in writing. In addition, the faculty should be informed in writing by the dean of the reappointment decision.

28.4 Reviews of Central Administration

https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/community-policies/academic-review
a. Scope. The primary purposes of this academic review program are twofold: 1) to provide an occasion for central administration officers to evaluate their programs and sub-units and, in return, to explain the roles, functions, procedures, and activities of their offices and officers to the faculty; and 2) to permit a systematic faculty evaluation of these offices and officers aimed at making recommendations for improvements in administrative structure and/or performance. The review procedure is intended to improve the capacity of administrative offices and officers to support and enhance the teaching, research, and service goals of the University. Moreover, the academic review is intended to facilitate communication between administrative officials and the faculty, and to make it possible for the faculty to participate actively in the governance of the University.

b. Timing. The Office of the President and the offices of each vice president of the University should be reviewed at least once every seven years. The University President shall consult with the Faculty Council in establishing a schedule of reviews.

c. Responsibility. The University President and the President of the Faculty Senate shall be jointly responsible for the conduct of the reviews of the offices of the vice presidents. For review of the Office of the President, the responsible central academic officer shall be the Executive Vice President and Provost.

d. Review preparation: The office under review is encouraged to provide the committee with the names of individuals who, through frequent contact with the office, may be able to provide the committee with relevant information for evaluating the office’s performance.

e. Self-Study: The office will prepare a self-study that will address the following areas:

(1) Goals. What are the various goals of the office? How are these goals established? What priorities are given to the principal goals of the office? How have these priorities changed, or what plans for changes in priorities are envisioned? What are the goals of the sub-units of the office? How well do the subordinate administrative units perform?

(2) Services and Programs. What services and programs are offered by the office? How effective are these programs and services and how was that determination made? What are their strengths and weaknesses? How do these activities support academic programs and relevant teaching or research missions?

(3) Staffing. What is the organizational structure of the office? Is the staff appropriately compensated and trained? Is the current staff adequate to provide the programs and services of the office? What are future staffing plans?

(4) Resources. What is the budget for the office? What priorities govern the allocation of budget resources administered by the office? What have been the changes in budgetary support for the office in recent years? Are administrative costs allocated appropriately? Are the facilities adequate? In general, what new resources are needed to effectively conduct the office’s core responsibilities?

(5) Internal and External Evaluation. What are the procedures used by the office for the review and evaluation of the office and its staff? What is the timetable for such reviews?
(6) Relationships with Other Offices. How does the office interact with other offices internal and external to the University? Does it maintain effective communications, cooperation, and coordination? Is there duplication or overlap in functions and responsibilities?

(7) Strategies for Improvement. What areas of the office’s performance are most in need of improvement? How does the office intend to improve its performance?

f. Review Committee. The review committee for each central administrative office will be appointed by the President of the University Faculty Senate and the central academic officer responsible for the review, with the advice and consent of the Faculty Senate. Normally, the review committee will consist of seven persons as follows:

(1) Chairperson

(2) External reviewer: Appointed from among off-campus persons nominated in consultation with the central administrator whose office is to be reviewed.

(3) Two members from the Faculty Senate’s Committee on the Selection of Central Academic Officials: appointed in consultation with its Chair.

(4) Three additional faculty members: Appointed after due consideration given to the representation of various faculty concerns and to the needs of the review committee for particular kinds of expertise, depending upon the office to be reviewed.

g. The Review.

(1) Procedure. The review committee will first develop specific procedures for conducting the review of central administrative offices commensurate with the need for information and assessment particular to the office involved.

(2) Responsibilities. In conducting the review, the committee will confer with all persons having responsibility for framing policies, directing the office, or approving procedures that affect the relationship between the office and the University community. The committee will examine all pertinent documents and have access to all appropriate and necessary information. Opinions concerning the performance of the academic office under review shall be solicited from members of the University community by at least the following means:

   i. notification of the request for such opinions will be made through the channels of administrative organization for faculty and staff;

   ii. the committee will attempt to identify and receive input from individuals who because of their interaction with the office being reviewed may have information relevant to the review process.

4 Committee Report. The review committee will prepare a report, which will become a public document and shall not contain confidential information related to the performance of the administrator of the office under review. The report will summarize the findings of the review committee and will include any recommendations it deems appropriate. This report will address the issues required to be discussed in the office self-study. A draft of this report will be submitted to the administrator of the office under review, to allow an opportunity to correct assertions of fact. The committee may meet and
confer with the administrator of the office under review and the University President to explain and discuss the principal recommendations in the draft report.

5 The final report will be delivered to the President of the Faculty Senate, to the central academic officer who commissioned the review, and the administrator of the office under review. If the President's office is under review, the report will be shared with the Board of Regents.

6 Procedural Variations. The central administrator who commissioned the review and the Faculty Senate President shall consider and may jointly approve departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, where the responsible administrator and the Faculty Senate President, in consultation with the administrator of the office being reviewed, agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of the review.

28.5 Multi-Year Academic Review of Administrators

a. The procedures described in this section pertain to periodic reviews of central administrative officers (President, Executive Vice President and Provost, vice presidents) and deans.

b. Purpose. A periodic review of a central administrative officer or dean may have the following objectives:

   (1) to develop a meaningful basis for the decision about whether to continue or to renew the appointment of a central administrative officer or dean; and/or

   (2) to enhance performance of the central administrative officer or dean.

c. Timing. Periodic reviews of collegiate deans shall occur every five years without regard to the timing of the review of the college. Reviews of central administrative officers shall coincide with the periodic review of the office or academic unit. Ad hoc reviews of deans may be conducted outside the five-year cycle according to the provisions below.

d. Responsibilities:

   (1) The individuals with responsibility for initiating periodic reviews of academic offices and academic units, as specified above in II-28.2 Collegiate Review and II-28.4 Reviews of Central Administration, also have the responsibility for initiating periodic reviews of the respective central administrative officers and deans. These individuals shall receive the report of the review committee and shall be responsible for determining whether to continue or renew the appointment of the central administrative officer or dean.

   (2) The central administrative officer or dean being reviewed shall be responsible for preparing a self-assessment for the period under review. The self-assessment may consider recommendations of prior reviews, the goals and mission, and, if applicable, the most recent strategic plan of the office or academic unit.

e. Review Committee Membership. For each review, a committee shall be appointed to make recommendations to the central administrator who commissioned the review. For the purposes of this subsection, the definition of "faculty members" is equivalent to the definition of faculty members who may vote in collegiate elections of representatives to the Faculty Council and Faculty Senate.
(1) For reviews of central administrative officers, the composition of the committee shall be as described above in II-28.4.

(2) For the review of deans, the composition of the committee will be determined by the Executive Vice President and Provost. At a minimum, each committee shall include:

   (a) One faculty member from outside the college.

   (b) Two faculty members from the college, selected in consultation with the faculty of the college.

   (c) One staff member from the college.

f. Scope. The administrator who commissioned the review shall identify for the review committee those aspects of the following areas that are most relevant to the central administrative officer’s or dean’s performance assessment:

   (1) Strategic Plan. Has the central administrative officer or dean taken a leadership role in formulating appropriate goals for the office or unit? If goals were agreed upon at the beginning of the period under review, to what degree have those goals been attained?

   (2) Scholarship. Does the central administrative officer or dean encourage and recognize scholarship among the faculty, and create an environment that fosters and encourages scholarly pursuits?

   (3) Leadership. Has the central administrative officer or dean demonstrated knowledge of developments and leadership beyond their unit, including campus wide leadership and leadership at the state or national level, as appropriate to their responsibilities? How effective is the central administrative officer or dean in stimulating discussion of new ideas and encouraging and guiding promising developments through to implementation? Has the central administrative officer or dean provided an environment within the unit, and between the unit and other parts of the University, that enhances the educational efforts of faculty and students? Does the central administrative officer or dean establish a professional and civil educational environment?

   (4) Personnel policies. Does the central administrative officer or dean demonstrate: active participation in recruitment; concern for enhancing faculty and staff effectiveness in accordance with the clear principle of merit; apply principles and policies of equal employment opportunity to the recruitment; and ensure the advancement and evaluation of faculty and staff?

   (5) Resource management. Central administrative officers and deans should actively advocate for resources adequate to enable the unit to achieve its full academic potential and strategic plan. Does the central administrative officer or dean allocate resources appropriately?

   (6) Relationships among constituencies. Does the central administrative officer or dean establish and enhance good working relationships with faculty, staff, students, external constituencies, and others with whom they regularly interact?

   (7) Policy making. Does the central administrative officer or dean provide appropriate information to faculty and other relevant constituencies in a timely and open manner to facilitate effective participation in policy making and provide opportunities for consultation through individual and
8. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Does the central administrative officer or dean demonstrate responsibility for promoting excellence by increasing the diversity, equity, and inclusion of faculty, staff, and students in all areas including recruitment, mission(s), retention and climate?

g. Procedures. The review committee shall obtain information and evaluations from faculty, staff, and students regarding the relevant performance areas identified. In partial fulfillment of their duties under this paragraph, committees reviewing deans shall collect, through a survey, anonymous faculty evaluations of the dean’s performance. The questions shall be informed by the categories of administrative performance listed in section f to the extent that they are relevant. The review committee evaluating a central administrative officer will be responsible for soliciting similar input from all relevant constituencies of the University community.

h. Review Report.

(1) Preparation. The review committee is responsible for: assembling the information obtained from faculty, staff, and students; formulating conclusions; making recommendations related to the professional development; and making a recommendation concerning the retention of the central administrative officer or dean. It shall compile a report containing this information, and those conclusions and recommendations shall be confidential. The review committee shall transmit the report to the administrator who commissioned the review within 15 business days of completing the interviews.

(2) Opportunity for Response. The administrator who commissioned the report will provide it to the central administrative officer or dean under review, who may then submit a written response within 15 business days.

(3) Final report. The report is considered a confidential personnel record. Some aspects of the review may be disclosed as expressly set forth in 28 (5)(i)(2).

i. Assessment of the Central Administrative Officer’s or Dean’s Performance.

(1) The administrator who commissioned the report will assess the results of the review and make a determination regarding the continued service by the central administrative officer or dean under review.

(2) Reporting. Each constituency consulted in connection with the periodic review of a central administrative officer or dean may receive feedback as to the initiator's decision regarding continuation of service or reappointment of the individual under review. If the administrator who commissioned the review makes a determination that is at odds with the retention recommendation of the review committee based on its overall assessment of the central administrative officer or dean, the initiator shall discuss with the constituency consulted in connection with the review the reasons for reaching a contrary determination and why it is in the best interests of the University.

j. Informing relevant constituencies. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall share the committee’s recommendations, a summary of the evaluation, and the determination regarding continued service with the
appropriate constituents. The Provost also will address material departures from the retention recommendations of the review committee, if any. This shall occur within one month of the Executive Vice President and Provost's receipt of the committee’s report and central administrative officer’s or dean’s response.

k. Ad Hoc Reviews.

(1) The supervisor may initiate an ad hoc review of a central administrative officer or dean at any time.

(2) The constituent faculty may request an ad hoc review of a central administrative officer or dean by petitioning the supervisor. If 50 percent or more of the constituent faculty petition the supervisor, the supervisor shall order an ad hoc review. If 25 percent to 50 percent of the constituent faculty petition the supervisor, the supervisor shall meet with the petitioning faculty to discuss the request and shall determine whether to order an ad hoc review.

(3) Ad hoc reviews will be conducted in the same manner as periodic reviews, subject to modifications jointly agreed on by the supervisor and the review committee.

28.6 Annual Review of Central and Collegiate Administrators

a. Applicability. This procedure is intended to guide: the President in the annual review of the vice presidents; the Executive Vice President and Provost in the annual review of those collegiate administrators reporting to the Executive Vice President and Provost; and each dean in the annual review of those administrators of collegiate departments or programs who report to the dean, each of whom is subsequently referred to as an evaluator.

b. Agreement of Goals. Each year, each administrator being reviewed and each evaluator will agree on a brief written statement of goals the administrator will pursue during the coming year. These goals should be linked both to the general categories within which the administrator is assessed on a multi-year basis, and to particular priorities identified through multi-year reviews of the administrator's unit, through strategic planning, and through consultation with faculty members in the unit and with other constituencies, as appropriate.

c. Annual Assessment Procedure. The evaluator shall conduct an annual assessment of the administrator's performance, including achievement of goals established for the year. As a part of the review, the administrator should provide to the evaluator a self-assessment addressing progress made on each goal. The evaluator may seek input from appropriate constituencies regarding the administrator’s performance. An evaluator who receives comments relevant to the review must share the substance of those comments with the administrator under review. The administrator under review shall have the opportunity to provide a response. The evaluator may pursue further investigation into the administrator’s performance based on the shared input and response.

d. The Assessment. The evaluator shall provide a written report of the performance assessment to the administrator under review, to which the administrator may submit a written response. At the dean’s discretion, performance assessments of administrators who report to a dean may be shared with the Executive Vice President and Provost.