

## **Protocol for Review of Non-Medical Center Deans**

**September 2005 by Provost Phelps and Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
Revised May 2008 by Provost Kuncel and Faculty Senate Executive Committee**

Decanal reviews occur on a regular five-year basis. At the UR, the review consists of two parallel processes, which should if at all possible be coordinated in several ways. The reviews are those of the President and Provost and of the faculty within the school of the Dean. To be effective, the decanal review is usually done in the first semester of the dean's fourth year, assuming a five-year term. The final decision rests with the President in consultation with the Provost. The faculty review provides one of the most valuable sources of information to help inform the President in his decision.

### **The President's and Provost's Review**

1. The Provost will request from the Dean a report that summarizes accomplishments over the past four years and establishes goals for next five years if renewal is expected. Parts of this report and prior reports will be available for the faculty review body (see below), and parts may be limited to only the President and Provost.
2. The Provost and Dean under review will assemble basic data such as student body size and quality, faculty hiring and retention, financial performance, reputation and development, and compare these with data from peer schools over time and at the UR.
3. The Provost will extend a broad invitation to faculty within the school for written (email or paper) input, with assurances of confidentiality.
4. The Provost will interview department chairs, and other faculty, senior administrators within the school, and advisory boards (when appropriate). Interviews should span all areas of the school, actively reaching out to assure that all relevant views have been heard. Typically, the Provost (and the President, in the case of the Senior Vice President and Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences & Engineering) will schedule these interviews on a one-on-one basis, allowing 30 to 60 minutes per interview. In the case when the Provost conducts the interviews, notes are shared only with the President, and information obtained from these interviews goes back to the Dean under review only in a way that assures anonymity of source.
5. The President and Provost write a report based on their review and the faculty review, and that report serves as a basis for the recommendation that goes to the Board of Trustees for approval. The President and/or Provost will also summarize results from their review into a report back to the dean, with anonymity of all respondents wholly preserved.

### **The Faculty Review**

This review process should be triggered by the President's and/or the Provost's announcement of the beginning of the decanal review. As part of this announcement it is important for the Provost to describe the review process and in particular the role of the Faculty Review Committee to the faculty of the school or unit.

If the school's faculty has an elected representative body, the Senate Governance Committee has recommended that the faculty representative group elect a committee of at least four faculty members who will conduct a review that focuses on faculty opinion of the performance of the Dean. It is not charged to give a recommendation but to conduct a review.

If no elected faculty representative body exists within the school, the Faculty Senate's Elections Committee should assist the school's faculty. The key issue is to select the faculty committee in a way that garners broad acceptance across the school. The process may or may not involve nominations, and the appropriate approach may vary by school. In any event, the Faculty Senate's Elections Committee should initiate the process within the school to establish a Faculty Review Committee. When the Provost signals that the review should begin, the Faculty Senate's Elections Committee will be informed, allowing them time to initiate the selection process within the school.

Once elected, the Faculty Review Committee should meet with the President and/or the Provost to be charged and to allow an opportunity for questions about goals and strategies. To aid the Faculty Review Committee at any stage of their work, the Senate Executive Committee will make itself available to meet with the Faculty Review Committee to discuss process and best practice.

Full confidentiality must be maintained throughout the entire process. The Faculty Review Committee should be provided with information necessary to evaluate the dean's performance, such as strategic planning documents and data about the school's success during the dean's tenure.

The Faculty Review Committee should conduct wide-ranging interviews with the faculty of the school in question. In conducting the interviews, the faculty committee should endeavor to reach a widely representative set of faculty from within the school. In some instances only a sample will be necessary in order for the Provost and the President to have confidence that an effective representation of faculty opinion can be made. The committee should work to gather views of the faculty, separating their own personal views and opinions from those garnered in the review process. If sampling is used, the Provost and the Faculty Review Committee should meet after the preliminary set of interviews have been accomplished to see if a more in-depth sampling of faculty is necessary. If there is a cohesion of views both within and across the two sets of reviews, it may be proper to conclude at that time. If the reviews are mixed or point to a negative outcome, then more fully comprehensive interviews with a larger sample or with the entire tenured faculty may be appropriate to assure that the President has full information available to make a final determination.

Finally, the Faculty Review Committee will prepare a confidential report outlining its findings that will be shared orally in a meeting with the Provost and the President.

## **Excerpts from the Faculty Governance Report**

### **Decanal reviews**

School deans and the vice provost for health affairs are typically appointed for five-year terms with the performance of each being reviewed by the provost in the fourth year. The review process includes confidential interviews with numerous faculty of the school in question. We recommend that during this process a similar review be conducted by a committee appointed by the elected faculty body of the school (if it has one) or elected by the school faculty as a whole. It should consist of at least four tenured faculty members broadly representative of the school involved.

This committee should be provided with information relevant to evaluating the dean's performance such as strategic planning documents and data about the school success during the dean's tenure. It should coordinate its activities with those of the provost and record its findings in a confidential report that will be shared in a meeting with the provost and president.

### **Presidential and Provostial reviews**

The provost is also typically appointed for a five year term with a performance review around the fourth year. The board may choose to review the president's performance in depth at similar intervals. To our knowledge this process has been less formal in recent years than that of decanal reviews. We recommend a faculty role in such reviews similar to that described above for deans. A faculty review committee should be appointed by the Faculty Senate consisting of at least four tenured faculty members not all from the same school. This committee should interview faculty and other interested parties of its choice. It should coordinate its activities with those of the board and/or the president. Its confidential report should be discussed with the board and (in the case of provostial review) with the president.

Faculty participation in the review of a dean or other academic administrator would be desirable for several reasons:

It would give the provost greater insight into the dean's performance and a firmer basis for a reappointment decision

A committee could collect more information than the provost acting alone

It would promote wider discussion of the goals and priorities of the school

It could give the dean a better understanding of the ongoing concerns of faculty