

Title/Subject: **PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF DEANS AND OTHER ACADEMIC SENIOR OFFICERS**

Applies to: faculty staff students student employees visitors contractors

Effective Date of This Revision: July 1, 2017

Contact for More Information: Provost's Office

Board Policy Administrative Policy Procedure Guideline

BACKGROUND:

These guidelines have been established to outline the evaluation procedures of deans and other academic senior officers.

PURPOSE:

This document outlines procedures to guide the Provost in the evaluation of deans and other academic senior officers (such as Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, Dean of Libraries). There are two processes described below: (1) Annual Review and (2) 6th-Year Periodic Comprehensive Review.

The first review has a heavy emphasis on attaining annual goals as elaborated through a yearly meeting with the Provost for input into the university employee review documentation. The 6th-Year Periodic Comprehensive Review is designed to be collaborative involving students, staff, faculty, department chairs, deans, the Provost, and others as appropriate. This comprehensive review provides the opportunity for constructive input from many constituencies and provides feedback on performance. Ultimately, the evaluation of the deans and other academic senior officers is the responsibility of the Provost.

PROCEDURE:

1. Annual Review

Inputs for deans and other academic senior officers: Since this review is of two groups with very different responsibilities, only those inputs that are appropriate to the position need to be included in the annual review.

- Enrollment in the college: (a) goals met for majors; and (b) goals met for SCH
- Reduction in SCH to degree completion (consistent with Strategic Plan)
- Academic Programs
 - New programs (number)
 - Deleted programs (number)
 - Programs converted to alternate delivery modes (number)
- Successful specialized accreditation of programs and continued accreditation of existing programs
- Proper and appropriate management of funds, including assessment of return on investments (such as start-up dollars, development of college infrastructure, etc.)
- Achievement of fund-raising goals (with input from VP Advancement)
- Faculty and student scholarship/creativity in the college

Authority: Michael A. Gealt, Executive Vice President/Provost

History: None - new policy

Indexed as: dean evaluation procedure; academic senior officer evaluation procedure

Title/Subject: **PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF DEANS AND OTHER ACADEMIC SENIOR OFFICERS**

- External funding or research expenditures
- Department national ranking(s)
- Demonstrate ongoing updates of departmental bylaws to show improvement of qualitative and quantitative requirements for promotion and tenure
- Evidence of mutually beneficial partnerships. Evidence must show benefit to partner as well as to the university.
- Evidence of effective service to and collaboration with other campus units
- Evidence of university leadership
- Evidence gathered by the Provost through discussion with chairs, faculty, staff, and other leadership in the unit
- Goals for the next year (excluding those set by VP Advancement)

Output:

- Discussion between the dean or other academic senior officer and the Provost
- Completion of university annual review form

2. 6th-Year Periodic Comprehensive Review

Many factors affect the effectiveness of the deans and other academic senior officers. In addition, that effectiveness is perceived differently by various constituent groups. The criteria for the evaluation are based on the job description on file with Human Resources (which is public) as well as the support of university priorities, including (but not limited to) leadership, personnel management, fund raising, effective communication, effective academic program management (e.g., addition/deletion of programs, successful accreditation reviews, etc.) and management of fiscal resources. The process is nearly the same for both deans and other academic senior officers, but may need to be slightly modified on a case-by-case basis.

Overview of the Process:

This comprehensive review includes a self-evaluation by the dean or academic senior officer (due by **January 15** of the year of the review); data (survey and/or focus groups) from students, staff, and faculty in the college and other colleges as appropriate; leadership in other colleges; and others (including those external to the college or university) as the Provost may deem appropriate. The self-evaluation may include the results of the Leadership Standards Survey conducted by Human Resources every three years. The use of external reviewers for deans is difficult as position descriptions vary from college-to-college and university-to-university. Therefore, external reviewers will only be used if there is mutual agreement between the Provost, the dean and the *ad hoc* Review Committee chair. The *ad hoc* Review Committee, established by the Provost and described in greater detail below, will be charged with data evaluation and providing the Provost with a written summary statement followed by an in-person meeting with the dean.

The Provost will host a constructive performance review with the dean and the chair of the *ad hoc* Review Committee, in a private meeting, to discuss the *ad hoc* Review Committee's feedback and, if applicable, the external reviewer's report. This will complete the performance evaluation. The Provost will develop a short summary of the evaluation to be retained in the Provost's files. A public statement will be prepared to share with college faculty and staff, as well as with the university president, indicating that a comprehensive review has been completed.

Ad hoc Review Committee:

This committee will be established by **November 15** of the year of the review.

For academic deans, the Review Committee consists of:

- 4 faculty (at least one fixed-term) (Nominations will be accepted by the Provost until November 1 of the year of the review.)
- 1 staff member
- 1 undergraduate student (for colleges with large graduate population, a graduate student may also be appropriate)
- 1 department chair
- 1 representative from outside the college

For other academic senior officers, the Review Committee consists of:

Title/Subject: **PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF DEANS AND OTHER ACADEMIC SENIOR OFFICERS**

- 2-3 senior leadership team members
- 2-3 deans, chairs, and/or faculty (Nominations will be accepted by the Provost until November 1 of the year of the review.)
- 1 staff member
- 1-2 students

The Review Committee members are appointed in consultation between the Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Effectiveness and department chairs, except for the representative from outside the college. The representative from outside the college will be appointed directly by the Provost, and may be a person external to the university. If possible, some Review Committee members may be asked to serve for multiple reviews to provide consistency and memory to the process. All Review Committee members will be expected to sign a non-disclosure agreement to assure the confidentiality needed in personnel issues. The Review Committee membership will then be made public to the college faculty, staff, and students.

By **January 15**, the Review Committee will meet to determine their procedures for collecting data. The Office of Institutional Research is available to assist with the development and validation of any evaluation survey instruments.

On or before **March 15** the chair of the Review Committee will provide the Provost with a confidential, written report no longer than 8 single-spaced pages. Any survey results or other data, including the demographics of the respondents, collected during the review process will be appended to the report. The report should provide an assessment of the unit's progress under the leadership of the dean or academic senior officer and recommendations for improvement/action steps (if any) to the Provost. Within one week of March 15, the chair of the Review Committee will meet with the academic dean or senior officer and the Provost to discuss the Review Committee's findings and recommendations. Exceptions to this deadline must be mutually agreed upon by the chair of the Review Committee, the dean, and the Provost.

At the conclusion of the review, the Provost will write a one-page summary report to be shared with the dean or academic senior officer, the chair of the Review Committee, and the university president. This statement will remain part of the personnel file. Those involved in the evaluation process will receive a short statement of the completion of the evaluation process to thank them for their input with a copy to the co-chairs of the Shared Governance and Communication Committee.

Central Michigan University reserves the right to make exceptions to, modify or eliminate this policy and or its content. This document supersedes all previous policies, procedures or guidelines relative to this subject.