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)

28.1 General Purpose
(Amended 2/07)

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, both as to underrepresented minorities and women.

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. 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. These policies may be supplemented by policies and guidelines for academic program reviews, collegiate reviews, and decanal reviews that are developed by the Executive Vice President and Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate. 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, as supplemented by the policies and guidelines promulgated by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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 2/07)

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 and at least two reviewers from off campus.

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, reviews should be coordinated with external accreditation evaluations. Reviews may also be scheduled to coordinate with other specific circumstances, e.g., a pending change in collegiate leadership or an impending significant change in resource needs.
In order to assure that the review can benefit evaluation and planning in a timely fashion, the process of review should begin in the last half of the preceding year. Generally, it is anticipated that the collegiate self-study will be completed by the end of the first semester of the review year, that the peer review will be conducted during the second semester and that the final report will be submitted prior to the end of the academic year.

c. Responsibility. 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.

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:

1. Collegiate Mission and Goals: The overall mission and goals of the college and their contribution to the University mission.
2. Strategic Plan. The suitability of the collegiate strategic plan and progress toward achieving plan goals should be examined.

3. Students. Projected 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.

4. Educational Programs. Instructional programs of the college should be assessed in regard to:
   1. the learning objectives of the program;
   2. curriculum content in relation to the learning objectives of the program;
   3. student achievement of learning objectives of the program;
   4. program changes since last review and success of changes in relation to program learning objectives;
   5. recommendations for program changes based on recent assessments and other pertinent data;
   6. the relation of the program to the goals of the college;
   7. the continuing need for the program;
   8. the overall quality of the program; and
   9. the interaction of faculty and students with other parts of the University (e.g., development of and participation in interdisciplinary programs).

5. 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.

6. Service Programs. The nature of programs or individual efforts that provide services to the college, to the University, to the state, to the nation, and to others; the contribution of service activities to instructional, scholarly, and creative activities.

7. Faculty. A profile of the faculty including educational background, teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative contributions, and service. The assessment of faculty obviously is related closely to evaluation of educational and service programs and scholarly and creative activities.
8. Facilities and Support Services. The adequacy of space and support facilities such as library, computers, staff assistance, instructional aids, equipment, and supplies. Assessment in this area also is related closely to evaluation of instructional and service programs and scholarly and creative activities.


1. organizational structure of the college, including committees, communication among faculty, students, and dean; adequacy of the structure for discharging regular collegiate responsibilities.

2. role of faculty, students, and administration in collegiate affairs and the nature of their interaction.

3. relationship of the college to the University, the alumni, and the field.

4. effectiveness of collegiate strategic planning and plan implementation processes.

10. 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.

3. Criteria for Program Evaluation. Specific criteria for program evaluation are determined by the Executive Vice President and Provost. The program review should result in assessments based on the primary criteria of quality and centrality, and the secondary criteria of student demand, potential for excellence, external impact, and cost.

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 and the Executive Vice President and Provost shall play in the selection of the self study committee. In the absence of any such procedures, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall appoint faculty of the college to serve on the self study committee.

The self-study committee is charged with developing the collegiate self-study with the cooperation of the
f. Self-Study.

1. General. The collegiate self-study is at the heart of a successful review. It assures that the college is reviewing its condition. The college should reexamine its goals and reflect, with as much sound data as possible, on how various activities contribute to the achievement of those goals and identify priorities and directions for the future. Thus, a self-study should not be solely a description of current programs and activities; it also must involve evaluation and projection. It should anticipate programmatic changes that may be required by new developments in knowledge or in societal conditions, including enrollment projections based on demographic and other relevant data. It should serve as a stimulus to systematic consideration of current and future directions of the college by the major collegiate constituencies. The self-study will achieve these goals by addressing 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. The self-study committee should consult with the collegiate administration and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost to determine what types of data are needed for the review. The collegiate administration and the Executive Vice President and Provost shall provide the committee with those data.

3. 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 reallocations should be identified in the self study.
g. Post Self-Study Procedures.

1. Peer group review of the college will be accomplished by a "review committee" composed of University faculty and staff from outside the college and at least two consultants from off campus appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

   The chair of the review committee will meet with the Executive Vice President and Provost to plan the specific steps to be taken and to establish a tentative timetable for the review.

   The 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 to identify strengths and weaknesses of the college and will make recommendations concerning possible improvements and future directions in the college.

   The 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 so that errors of fact and problems in wording may be identified and corrected. The review report shall not contain confidential personnel information concerning the collegiate dean or other collegiate personnel. The Executive Vice President and Provost will submit the draft report of the committee to the collegiate dean and college study committee so that any additional errors of fact and problems in 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.

2. Consideration and Implementation of the Review Report. The Executive Vice President and Provost will submit the final draft review report to the college for a response to the report and its recommendations. Copies of the review report will be made available to students and faculty in the college and, upon request, to others. In general, the following steps will occur:

   1. The dean and the self-study committee shall respond in writing to the review findings and recommendations. The dean and self-study committee will consult with college faculty to inform this response. This process should be specified in collegiate policy. Such responses, if any, will become part of the total review report.
2. The Executive Vice President and Provost will meet with the review committee to discuss the report and the collegiate response in order to clarify the committee's findings and recommendations as needed.

3. 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.

4. 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.

h. Procedural Variation. The Executive Vice President and Provost will consider and may approve departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, where the Executive Vice President and Provost and the faculty 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 and Program Review
(Amended 2/07)

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

Review, particularly of a small department, need not be long and complex. It should concentrate on essentials. 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 from off campus.

b. Timing. Review of a specific department shall be carried out at least every seven years. The collegiate dean(s) 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.

c. Responsibility. The Executive Vice President and Provost has the responsibility for establishing general policy and procedural guidelines for departmental reviews. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall carry out this responsibility in consultation with appropriate faculty and administrative groups.

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 for such reviews in accord with such policies and procedures. However, when graduate programs are involved, the specific college and the Graduate College share these responsibilities on a joint basis. In such cases, integrated procedures and guidelines for joint review of undergraduate and graduate programs in a unit are to be established.

Note: Throughout this subsection the terms "college(s)" and "collegiate dean(s)" are used to refer to a specific college or dean, to the Graduate College or dean, or to both functioning on a joint basis as specified in the above policy. Also, in this subsection, the term "department" will be used to refer to degree-granting academic units (i.e., traditional departments, non-department programs, and interdisciplinary programs).

d. Scope.

1. General. Reviews should represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of a department or program with recognition of the mutual dependency of programs and activities. An able student body, a faculty engaged in effective teaching and scholarship, effective administration, and adequate facilities and support services all contribute to the success of a department and must be reviewed as a whole.

2. Units Reviewed. The basic units, for purposes of review, are defined as follows:

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. The term "departmental executive officer" (abbreviated DEO) refers to the academic administrator of any such 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.

3. Areas to Be Considered. The college(s) 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.

   It is intended that reviews be focused on specific areas and questions that are most relevant to the particular department or program. These areas and questions should be specified by the college(s) 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. Listed below are the general areas that are ordinarily subject to a departmental review.

1. Departmental Mission and Goals. The overall mission and goals of the department and their contribution to the college and University missions.

2. Strategic Plan. The suitability of the departmental strategic plan and progress toward achieving plan goals.

3. Students. Projected student enrollment over a seven-year period, admissions policies and procedures, quality, advising, governance, placement services, student perceptions of the department, its program, faculty, and administration.

4. Educational Programs. Instructional programs of the department should be assessed in regard to:

   1. the learning objectives of the program;
   
   2. curriculum content in relation to the learning objectives of the program;
3. student achievement of learning objectives of the program;

4. program changes since last review and success of changes in relation to program learning objectives;

5. recommendations for program changes based on recent assessments and other pertinent data;

6. the relation of the program to the goals of the college;

7. the continuing need for the program;

8. the overall quality of the program; and

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

5. 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.

6. Service Programs. The nature of programs or individual efforts that provide services to the college, to the University, to the state, to the nation, and to others; the contribution of service activities to instructional programs and scholarly and creative activities.

7. Faculty. A profile of the faculty including educational background, teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative contributions, and service. The assessment of faculty obviously is related closely to evaluation of educational and service programs and scholarly and creative activities.

8. Facilities and Support Services. The adequacy of space and support facilities such as library, computers, staff assistance, instructional aids, equipment, and supplies. Assessment in this area also is related closely to evaluation of instructional and service programs and scholarly and creative activities.

4. Criteria for Program Evaluation. Specific criteria for program evaluation are determined by the Executive Vice President and Provost. Emphasis in the departmental review should be placed on evaluating the need for various programs based on enrollment projections, their quality, and the way in which they relate to the goals of the program, the college, and the University. The program review should result in assessments based on the primary criteria of quality and centrality, and the secondary criteria of student demand, potential for excellence, external impact, and cost.
Particular attention should be focused on ways in which improvements in programs and functions can be achieved within currently available departmental resources, or if indicated by enrollment trends and other factors, with appropriately reduced resources. The review should identify areas of flexibility in resources which could allow future allocations.

e. Self-Study Committee. The dean will ask the departmental faculty to determine in consultation with the DEO the process for preparing the self-study report.

f. Self-Study.

1. General. The first, and most crucial, 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. These guidelines should ensure that the self-study:

   1. is evaluative, not solely descriptive, and identifies priorities and directions for the future;

   2. is carried out with consultation among faculty, students, and other appropriate groups;

   3. 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;

   4. is distributed so as to make it available to all departmental faculty for their input or comment, prior to its being edited in a final form; and

   5. 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 (paragraph g(1) below). Ordinarily, the self-study will achieve these goals by addressing the major areas described in paragraph d(3) above.

2. Data. A standardized data format should be determined by the college(s). The use of data in standard formats already available in departments, colleges, or the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost will reduce the need for special data collection efforts.

g. Post Self-Study Procedures.
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 colleges:

1. Committee members may not be members of reviewed unit;

2. 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;

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

4. Procedures for selecting review committees and the description of the role of external reviewers must be approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost; and

5. 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 Executive Vice President and Provost's general policy will include procedures for the unit, the collegiate dean(s), and the Executive Vice President and Provost to 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 convey it to the Executive Vice President and Provost and to the unit or program. Any written response from the unit or program will become part of the review report and will be conveyed to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

It is the policy of the University that either the review reports or their substance shall be made available to departmental faculty and students and, upon request, to others.

The dean, in consultation with the Executive Vice President and Provost, and 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.

h. 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 (2/07; 10/09)

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 or prior to reappointment (if this occurs earlier) of the DEO or program director. Subsequent reviews of the DEOs and program directors shall also occur at least every five years but always prior to reappointment.

c. Responsibility. The faculty of each college has the responsibility to establish policies and procedures for reviews of DEOs and program directors. As a consequence, this policy should be written and publicly available. Furthermore, it should be approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost. The collegiate dean has the responsibility to conduct these reviews in accord with such policies and procedures.

d. Scope. Ordinarily, reviews should cover the following areas, recognizing that circumstances of the unit lead by the DEO or program director may alter the areas in which a DEO or program director is evaluated. This and other information shall at a minimum be based on information derived from systematic assessment of the views of the faculty members of the relevant department or program.

1. Goal formation and attainment. The DEO or program director should take a leadership role in formulating appropriate goals for the unit, reflecting awareness of educational and professional trends, and should consult with members of the unit in the process of doing so. Goals should be agreed upon with the reviewing authority at the beginning of the review period. An assessment should be made regarding the degree to which goals have been attained.

2. Educational leadership. Effectiveness in stimulating programs aimed at professional development of faculty and staff, plus effectiveness in stimulating discussion of new ideas about teaching and programs
and in encouraging and guiding promising developments through to implementation — encouragement of
scholarly activity.

3. Quality of personnel policies. Concern for and zeal in recruiting or encouraging the recruiting of the highest
quality new appointments available; concern for enhancing faculty in accordance with the clear principle
of merit; performance in applying principles and policies of equal employment opportunity to the
recruiting, advancement and evaluation of faculty and staff; performance in evaluating associate and
assistant administrators to promote professional development and enhance the performance of the
administrator’s office.

4. Establishment of a congenial educational environment. Has the administrator helped to provide an
environment within their unit and between the unit and other parts of the University that forwards the
educational efforts of faculty and students?

5. Resource acquisition. DEOs and program directors who have budgetary authority for academic units
should seek to obtain resources adequate to enable the unit to achieve its full academic potential. DEOs
and program directors should arrange for appropriate support services for the unit.

6. Relationships among constituencies. Establishing and enhancing good working relationships with faculty,
staff, students, external constituencies, and those other administrators with whom the DEO or program
director being reviewed regularly interacts.

7. Involvement of faculty and other relevant constituencies in planning and policy making. Providing
opportunities for consultation through individual and group meetings; providing information (with the
exception of information to which access is restricted by other policies) in a timely, full, and open manner
to facilitate effective participation in planning and policy-making.

8. Diversity. Promoting excellence in education by increasing the diversity of faculty, staff, and students is a
central goal and a core value of The University of Iowa. The DEO or program director is accountable for
making progress in diversity, including the areas of recruitment, mission(s), and climate.

9. Reappointment. Faculty members should have the opportunity to recommend to the dean whether or not
the DEO or program director should be reappointed as DEO or program director.

e. Review report. Recognizing that there is wide variation in the methods used by colleges for these reviews,
the minimum requirements for reporting the results of the review of the DEO or program director are:
1. The DEO or program director should have an opportunity to respond to the review in writing.

2. The faculty should be informed in writing by the dean of the results of the review.

### 28.4 Reviews of Central Administration

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

**d. Scope.** The reviews of central academic offices and the coordinated reviews under [II-28.5](#) of central academic officers will focus upon operations that are clearly related to academic affairs or to the welfare of the faculty. In consultation with the administrator of the office under review, the Faculty Senate President and the responsible central academic official may include within the review other operations of that office. The review should represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the office on which it focuses, with recognition of the mutual dependency of programs and activities.

**e. Review Committee.**
1. Membership. The ad hoc review committee for each central administrative office and officer 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: Appointed by the Faculty Senate President and the central academic officer responsible for the review with the approval of the Senate.

2. External reviewer: Appointed as indicated above 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: Two appointed as indicated above from among the members of this Committee, in consultation with its Chair.

4. Three additional faculty members: Appointed as indicated above. In the selection of these members, due consideration will be given to the representation of various faculty concerns, including Faculty Senate membership, and to the needs of the review committee for particular kinds of expertise, depending upon the office to be reviewed.

Selection of committee members will be made in accord with general University policies and practices regarding affirmative action.

2. Budget. In establishing a review committee, the Faculty Senate President and the central academic officer responsible for the review will provide an appropriate budget to make it possible for the committee to perform its duties effectively.

f. Self-Study. In preparation for a review, an office will prepare a self-study for the review committee. This Evaluation and Analysis Report will include, but not be limited to, the office's goals, rationale, programs, services, staffing, resources, internal evaluation processes, relations with other offices, and program strategies for improvement. The office is also encouraged to provide the review committee with the names of faculty members who through frequent interaction with the office may be able to provide the committee with helpful information for evaluating its performance. Within the general categories indicated, the following issues and questions should be addressed:

1. Goals. What are the various purposes, aims, or goals of the office? How are these goals established and what is the faculty's role in this process? 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. **Rationale.** In what ways are the goals of the office compatible with the role of the University and its mission statement? How are the programs administered by the office responding to the needs of the faculty, staff, and students, the people of the State of Iowa, and the nation? How are the office's goals and purposes coordinated with those of other University offices and agencies, and with the Regents of the University? Where appropriate, what are the relationships between the office and the Governor's office, the Iowa General Assembly, and other sources of University support and funding?

3. **Programs.** What are the program activities of the office? What subordinate administrative units are involved in these programs? How effective are these programs? What are their strengths and weaknesses? Exactly how is the program effectiveness of the office determined and evaluated?

4. **Services.** What are the services provided by the office and its sub-units? What support and facilities are provided to the faculty? How effective are the services provided for or supervised by the office? What plans and undertakings are being considered to upgrade teaching, research, and service facilities? What priorities are attached to present services, or to the logistical support services embedded in future plans?

5. **Staffing.** What is the table of staff organization for the office? What are the salaries of staff persons? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the staff? How are staff persons recruited? How is their performance evaluated? Is the present staff adequate to provide the programs and services of the office? What are future staffing plans?

6. **Resources.** What is the budget for the office? What priorities govern the allocation of budget resources administered by the office? What proportion of the office budget is allocated for activities or functions directly related to faculty teaching and research? What have been the changes in budgetary support for the office in recent years? How does the office evaluate its budget success? Are administrative costs too high, or too low? What facilities does the office have at its disposal? Are the facilities adequate? If inadequate, what changes need to be made, or are being planned? In general, what new resources are needed to improve the quality of education, research, and service provided by the University?

7. **Internal Evaluation.** What are the procedures used by the office for the review and evaluation of that office and its subordinate administrative units? What is the timetable for such reviews? Have there been external reviews of sub-units? Are there plans for such external reviews?
8. Relations With Other Offices. How does the office and its sub-units interact with other University offices? Does it maintain effective communications, cooperation, and coordination with other offices as needed? Is there duplication or overlap in functions and responsibilities with other offices?

9. Strategies for Improvement. What areas in the office's performance are most in need of improvement? How does the office intend to improve its performance? What are its development plans? What specific lines of development are being pursued? How is this being accomplished?

These guidelines are intended to aid the office being reviewed in developing an Evaluation and Analysis Report. The report should, to the extent possible, emphasize academically related as opposed to purely housekeeping activities. Foremost in the report should be evaluation and analysis of activities directly associated with faculty teaching, research, and service.

g. Post Self-Study Procedures.

1. Committee Authority. Specific procedures for conducting the review of central administrative offices and officers will be worked out by each review committee commensurate with the needs for information and assessments particular to the office involved.

2. Consultation and Access to Information. The committee, in conducting the review, will confer with all persons (including the University President) having responsibility for framing policies, directing the office, or approving procedures that affect the relationship between the office and the faculty. The committee will examine all pertinent documents, and have access to all appropriate and necessary information. Opinions concerning the performance of the academic office and officer under review shall be solicited from members of the University community by at least the following means (as well as by any others deemed by the committee to be appropriate):

1. publication in fyi of a call for such opinions;

2. notification of the request for such opinions through the channels of administrative organization: deans to notify DEOs, DEOs to notify departmental faculty; a parallel method is to be used to bring the review to the attention of staff;

3. the committee will attempt to identify faculty and others who because of their interaction with the office being reviewed may have especially useful information to provide to the review process, and the committee will solicit the comments of such persons.
3. Meetings. The committee will meet as often as necessary to prepare their reports and recommendations.

4. Committee Report. The review committee will prepare an Office Report, which will become a public document and will not contain confidential information related to the evaluation of the performance of the administrative officer. 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, primarily to allow for an opportunity to correct assertions of fact. The committee will meet and confer with the administrator under review and with the University President (or, if the University President is under review, with the President of the Board of Regents) to explain and discuss the principal recommendations in the draft report.

Once these processes have been completed, the final report will be forwarded to the President of the Faculty Senate and to the central academic officer responsible for the review. Copies of the final report will also be submitted to the administrator of the office under review (who may make copies for subordinates in or reporting to that office); if the President's office is under review, to the Board of Regents; and to the Chair of the Senate's Committee on the Selection of Central Academic Officials.

Appropriate provision will be made to have copies of the office's Evaluation and Analysis Report and the review committee's Office Report available to all University faculty members.

5. Follow-up. The Chair shall reconvene the review committee approximately one year after its report is submitted to determine to what extent the recommendations contained in its report have been or are being implemented. At least three weeks in advance of this meeting, through fyi, the committee will solicit from the University community, perceptions of the effectiveness with which the recommendations of the Office Report have been implemented.

When the review was of a vice president's office, this meeting will include the President of the University, the vice president whose office had been reviewed, and the President of the Faculty Senate.

When the review was of the President's Office, this meeting will include the President of the Board of Regents, the President of the University, and the President of the Faculty Senate.
h. Procedural Variations. The central administrator responsible for a 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 officer being reviewed and with the Faculty Council, 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
(Amended 2/07)

The procedures described in this section pertain to periodic reviews of central academic officers (President, Executive Vice President and Provost, vice presidents) and deans. These procedures do not pertain to the review of other academic officers reporting to central academic officers or to deans, which fall under II-28.6 below. Procedures for the review of departmental executive officers and program heads and directors are described above in II-28.3(2).

a. Purpose. A periodic review of an academic administrator should have the following objectives:

1. to develop a meaningful basis for the decision about whether or not to reappoint an administrator who is on a term appointment,

2. to provide support for the continued appointment of an administrator who is appointed at will,

3. to enhance administrative performance of the administrator,

4. to increase professional development for the administrator, and

5. to improve accountability of the administrator to appropriate constituencies.

b. 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 academic officers shall coincide with the periodic review of the officer's office or academic unit. Ad hoc reviews of deans may be conducted outside the five-year cycle according to the provisions of II-28.5i below.

c. 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 academic officers. These individuals (hereinafter "initiators") shall receive the report of the review committee and shall be responsible for determining whether or not to offer the administrator a reappointment for an additional term.

2. The administrator shall be responsible for preparing for the initiator and the review committee a self-assessment of their performance during the period under review. The self-assessment shall take into account recommendations of prior reviews, the goals and mission, and, if applicable, the most recent strategic plan of the office or academic unit. The administrator's self-assessment shall be delivered to the initiator before the review committee is appointed.

3. The review committee shall work with the initiator to prepare an assessment tool (e.g., web survey) for the review.

4. The review committee shall be responsible for gathering any additional information that it thinks necessary to prepare an assessment of the administrator's performance.

d. Review Committee Membership. For each periodic and ad hoc review, a review committee (hereinafter the "committee") shall be organized to compile information and make recommendations to aid in the overall assessment of the administrator. For reviews of central academic officers, the composition of the committee shall be as described above in II-28.4. For the review of deans, the composition of the committee will be determined by the Executive Vice President and Provost. The size of the committee may vary, but, at a minimum, each committee shall include:

1. One faculty member from outside the college.

2. Two faculty members from the college, selected in consultation with the faculty of the college.

3. One staff member from the college selected in consultation with Staff Council.

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.
e. Scope. The committee shall evaluate the administrator’s performance within each of the following areas, taking into account the degree to which each area relates to the administrator’s responsibilities. The committee should consult with the initiator in identifying those aspects of the following areas that are most pertinent to assessing the administrator’s performance:

1. Goal formation and attainment. Has the administrator taken a leadership role in formulating appropriate goals for the office or unit, reflecting awareness of educational and professional trends, and have they consulted with faculty of the office/unit in the process of doing so? 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 administrator encourage scholarship among the faculty, and does the administrator create an environment that fosters and encourages scholarly pursuits? Does the administrator recognize excellence in scholarship?

3. Educational leadership. How well does the office/unit fulfill its educational mission? How effective is the administrator in stimulating discussion of new ideas about teaching and in encouraging and guiding promising developments through to implementation? Has the administrator helped to provide an environment within the office/unit and between the office/unit and other parts of the University that enhances the educational efforts of faculty and students? Does the administrator establish a congenial educational environment?

4. Personnel management. Does the administrator show concern for and zeal in recruiting or encouraging the recruiting of the highest quality new appointments available? How well does the administrator do in choosing, evaluating, and supervising subordinates reporting directly to him or her? How well does the administrator’s office perform in general?

5. Resource management. Does the administrator seek to obtain resources that are adequate to enable the office/unit to achieve its full academic potential, and does the administrator arrange for appropriate support services for the office/unit?

6. Relationships among constituencies. Does the administrator establish and enhance good working relationships with faculty, staff, students, external constituencies, and those other administrators with whom the administrator regularly interacts?

7. Planning and policy making. Does the administrator: 1) involve the faculty and other relevant constituencies in planning and policy making; 2) provide opportunities for consultation through individual
and group meetings; and 3) provide information (with the exception of information to which access is restricted by other policies) in a timely, full, and open manner to facilitate effective participation in planning and policy making?

8. Human rights and diversity. Does the administrator provide effective leadership in the implementation of University policies relating to human rights and diversity, including policies on affirmative action?

9. Promoting constructive innovation. Does the administrator encourage constructive suggestions for new goals or programs, or new ways for accomplishing ongoing goals more effectively?

10. Scope of leadership. Has the administrator demonstrated knowledge of developments and educational leadership beyond their office/unit, including campuswide leadership and leadership at the state or national level, as appropriate to their responsibilities?

f. Procedures.

1. The committee shall devise mechanisms for obtaining information and evaluations from relevant faculty, staff, and students with regard to the relevant performance areas identified in section e. The chair of the committee will consult with the initiator concerning the mechanisms to be used, and the identity of any other constituencies from which information or evaluative statements should be solicited.

2. Central Academic Officers. The review committee evaluating a central academic officer will be responsible for soliciting from all members of the University community written and/or oral evaluations of the performance of the officer and the office under review. The committee will meet as often as necessary to review, discuss, and summarize in writing the results of this evaluation process, and to prepare any recommendations they deem appropriate.

3. Reviews of deans. In partial fulfillment of their duties under the preceding paragraph, committees reviewing deans shall collect, through a questionnaire, anonymous faculty evaluations of the administrator. The questions will be informed by the categories of administrative performance listed in section e to the extent that they are relevant. The faculty questions will conform to the requirements of paragraphs (a)–(c) below, while the form and content of the questions directed at staff and students will be within the committee's discretion.
1. Faculty respondents will be instructed to circle their responses for a single category/number on the following scale: No Chance to Observe / 1 Strongly Disagree / 2 Disagree / 3 Agree / 4 Strongly Agree. Each question will also provide an opportunity for a qualitative narrative response.

2. At a minimum, the faculty questionnaire shall ask respondents to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with the following five statements (the "core questions"):

1. The dean has my trust and respect. [ 1/2/3/4 ]

2. The dean does a good job in discharging the teaching mission of the unit. [ No chance to observe / 1/2/3/4 ]

3. The dean does a good job in promoting the quantity and quality of faculty scholarship. [ No chance to observe / 1/2/3/4 ]

4. Overall, the dean is effective. [ No chance to observe / 1/2/3/4 ]

5. The dean should be re-appointed for another term. [ Yes / No ]

g. Review Report.

1. Preparation. The committee is responsible for assembling the information obtained from faculty, staff, and students; formulating conclusions; and making a recommendation concerning the retention of the administrator. It shall compile a report containing this information, and those conclusions and recommendations shall be confidential.

2. Opportunity for Response. Upon completing its report, the committee shall transmit the report to the initiator who shall provide the administrator with a complete copy and permit the administrator to prepare a written response within 30 days.

3. After receiving the administrator’s response, if any, the committee will finalize the report.

4. Informing faculty in the case of reviews of deans. In the case of such reviews, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall, after receiving the final report assembled under this section and in consultation with the review committee, transmit the recommendations and the substance of the committee's evaluation to the constituent faculty. Transmission to the faculty shall be within two months of the Executive Vice President and Provost's receipt of the committee's report, but not in the summer. In transmitting the results of the
faculty questionnaire, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall report the response rate (the number and the proportion of the constituent faculty completing the questionnaire) and the aggregate responses (mean, standard deviation, median, and specific distribution) to each question posed to the faculty in the questionnaire, subject to the following limitations:

1. If the Executive Vice President and Provost decides not to reappoint the administrator, or the administrator elects not to seek reappointment, it will be solely within the Executive Vice President and Provost's discretion which of the aggregate responses, if any, are reported to the faculty.

2. Responses to the five core questions as defined in paragraph f(3)(b) above must be reported to the constituent faculty. The Executive Vice President and Provost has discretion to share or not share the specific responses to the other questions provided the Executive Vice President and Provost gives the faculty a summary of the strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation.

3. In every case, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall consult with the review committee concerning the transmission of the substance of the review committee's report to appropriate constituencies other than faculty, such as students and staff.

5. Informing Relevant Constituencies in the Case of Reviews of Central Academic Officers. The final report shall be distributed in the manner provided in paragraph g(4) above.

h. Initiator's Assessment of the Administrator's Performance.

1. Initiator Assessment. An additional step is required in the review of every administrator who is eligible for and willing to provide continued administrative service. This final step shall be an explicit written affirmation by the initiator that continued service by the administrator 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 of the administrator under a future ad hoc review. Administrators should consult with the initiator regarding guidelines for the handling of instances in which no affirmation is possible, or in which the initiator believes some significant improvement in performance is necessary, even if the administrator's performance is not so weak as to warrant a change in administrative leadership.

2. Reporting. In addition to the communication called for by paragraph g(4) above, each constituency consulted in connection with a periodic review of an administrator shall receive appropriate and timely feedback as to the initiator's decision regarding the administrator. This shall include express notification of
the faculty that the initiator has affirmed that continued service by the administrator would be in the best interests of the University. In the event that the initiator makes a determination that is at odds with the retention recommendation of the review committee based on its overall assessment of the administrator, the initiator shall discuss with the faculty the reasons for reaching a contrary determination.

i. Ad Hoc Reviews.

1. Constituent faculty may conduct ad hoc reviews of their administrator. Such reviews shall occur when ordered by the initiator: 1) on their own motion, 2) upon the request of the administrator, or 3) upon the request of the faculty pursuant to paragraph i(2) below.

2. The faculty, as defined in paragraph d(1)(c) above may request an ad hoc review of the administrator by petitioning the initiator. If 50 percent or more of the faculty petition the initiator, the initiator shall order an ad hoc review. If 25 percent to 50 percent of the faculty petition the initiator, the initiator shall meet with the petitioning faculty and discuss the request. Thereafter, the initiator shall decide 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 upon by the initiator and the committee pursuant to paragraph j below.

j. Procedural Variations. The initiator may consider and approve, for good cause shown, departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, if the initiator and the review committee agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of the review.

28.6 Annual Review of Administrators

a. Applicability. This procedure is intended to guide the President in the review of the vice presidents, the Executive Vice President and Provost in the review of those collegiate administrators reporting to the Executive Vice President and Provost, and each dean in the review of those administrators of collegiate departments or programs who report to the dean.

b. Agreement of Goals. Each year, each administrator being reviewed and each person evaluating an administrator ("the 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 (for example, "educational leadership"), 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. Each evaluator shall conduct an annual assessment of each administrator's progress in achieving goals established for the year. In assessing progress, each evaluator should obtain the views of each administrator as to the progress made on each goal. The evaluator should discuss with the administrator his or her progress and the evaluator's assessment of the administrator's achievements, and will provide a brief written summary of the results. The administrator has the right to offer a written response to the review.

d. Public Input. Faculty, students, staff, and other administrators should be made aware of the annual review processes and should be advised how to contribute their views to appropriate evaluators. Systematic interviewing or surveying, characteristic of the multi-year reviews, need not be a part of an annual review, except as an evaluator may deem it necessary. An evaluator who receives comments relevant to an annual review should share the substance of such comments with the administrator and make some appropriate response. This response may entail further investigation of an administrator’s performance.

e. Variations in Timing. Any administrator responsible for 20 or more informal evaluations under this section may implement the steps contemplated in paragraphs (b) and (c) every 18 months, instead of annually. With regard to any particular administrator reviewed on an 18-month basis, the Executive Vice President and Provost, in consultation with the reviewing administrator, may determine that an annual review is appropriate.