

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

1-22-2019

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda (1/22/2019)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate>

Recommended Citation

CSUSB Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda (1/22/2019)" (2019). *Faculty Senate records*. 99.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/99>

This Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Arthur E. Nelson University Archives at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate records by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A G E N D A

Tuesday, January 22, 2019

2:00-3:50PM

AD-145

Time Certain – 2:00PM

1. 20 Year Anniversary – CSU Center for Community Engagement – Diane Podolske
2. Approval of EC Minutes, 1/8/19, ECM 18-07
3. Approval of FS Minutes 1/15/19, FSM 18-05
4. Appointments (Attachments)

Time Certain – 2:30PM

5. FAM Changes: FAM 650.5, 650.7, 651.3 – Seval Yildirim
6. Electronic Voting – Haakon Brown
7. President's Report
8. Provost's Report
9. Chair's Report
10. FAC Report
11. EPRC Report
12. Statewide Academic Report

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, January 8, 2019
 2:00-3:50PM
 AD-145

Members Present: Karen Kolehmainen, Lasisi Ajayi, Rong Chen, Davida Fischman, Haakon Brown, Donna Garcia, Shari McMahan, Beth Steffel, Jodie Ullman, Jill Vasillakos-Long, President Morales

Visitors: Tom Provenzano, Grace King, Craig Seal, Olivia Rosas, Amy Braceros

1. Approval of EC Minutes – 11/27/18, ECM-18-06

The EC approved the Executive Committee minutes of November 27, 2018 as corrected.

2. Approval of FS Minutes – 11/13/18, FSM 18-04

The EC approved the Faculty Senate Minutes of November 13, 2018 as amended.

3. Suspension & Discontinuation of Programs – Grace Kelly & Tom Provenzano

- Grace reviewed programs which require action in CIM – discontinuation or conversion to Semester. Nothing has been done with these programs—just sitting out there.
- Some degree programs must fall under one of the following categories: Discontinuation, Suspension, Elevations from Concentrations to Degree Programs or Concentration Programs not modified in CIM due to business practice change of listing.
- Credential Programs have 2 options: Suspension (suspend through Fall 2023 via P-form) or Conversion to Semester and the P-form (must be completed by January 31, 2019)
- Grace needs to get flow chart approved before presenting to Faculty Senate. Will let Sylvia know.

4. Appointments

The EC made the following appointments:

- Honorary Degree Committee – Ahlam Muhtaseb, CAL (2019-2020)
- Graduation Initiative Task Force – Crystal Huang, CBPA
- Scholarship Committee – Melika Kordrostami, CBPA
- Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee – Judith Sylva, COE
- Committee for Exceptional Assigned Time (CEAT) – Marc Fudge, COE
- Search Committee for VP of Student Affairs – Judith Sylva, COE
- IT Governance Executive Committee – Yasha Karant, CNS

5. Q2S Recommendations: Catalog Rights & Summer 2020 Recommendations

These items will be on the next Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda as Information Items.

6. Nominations for Faculty Trustee Position

The deadline for applications has been extended to Monday, January 14, 2019. Beth Steffel is a candidate and Chairperson Kolehmainen/Sylvia will submit the signed nomination forms directly to: Reem Osman & Tracy Butler.

7. FAC – IDS RPT Guidelines

Ron will take another look at these—so they were tabled for further review.

- The EC had much discussion on SOTE's, numbers, number of published articles, etc.
- Need to have clear criteria and what they need to achieve.
- Suggest SOTE's count for a "percentage" of the weight given
- Numbers are very easily manipulated.
- Soften numbers on the SOTE's and soften quality of publications
- The voice of students is very important.
- A baseline for publications should be established
- SOTE's do not predict student learning or quality of learning
- Numbers make it too easy for the evaluator
- Senator Chen wants to review the "policy consistencies".
- What should the number of years to apply for tenure be? Should there be a number of years needed to work on the campus to apply? This is something we will be working on this year. Service credit issue still remains.
- FAM lists specific guidelines under Chapter 5, Personnel Evaluations for creating departmental evaluation guidelines: Research: *"Guidelines must avoid setting specific quantitative goals since each evaluation committee must evaluate both quantitative and qualitative aspects of professional activities and achievements."*
- To change this, we will have to reverse what the Senate voted (see above).

8. Priority Registration Appointment Process – Craig Seal, Olivia Rosas, Amy Braceros

- Want to get away from the term "priority"—look more at who needs to graduate first
- Former Vets, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, Note Takers will continue to have an earlier registration appointment.
- Those with honors and other academic recognition will still have priority within their classes. You would have an earlier registration appointment and would not see "priority registration."
- Note takers are usually within the same major
- We want to start this in Spring 2019.
- This will be placed as an agenda item on next FS Meeting.

9. Syllabus Policy Revised

- Accessibility requirement and the 1F is revised per attachment.

10. President's Report

- President Morales wished everyone Happy New Year and briefly mentioned 3rd Annual New Year's Celebration.
- We have a lunch date is set for January 29th with the President's Cabinet and the EC.

11. Provost's Report

- Update on two Dean Searches: Zoom Interviews CAL – starts next week. COE applications just closed and they will be meeting in two weeks.

12. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda – January 15, 2019, FSA 18-05

- EC Minutes should be included as Information Items on the Faculty Senate Agenda going forward.
- EPRC would like a time certain for FAM's under New Business.

13. Statewide Senate Tenets of Shared Governance in CSU

- Put a copy on the agenda for January 15 and ask them to review and will discuss at next FS Meeting.

14. Electronic Voting

- Discuss Electronic Voting in the next FS Meeting. Will need flexibility in the bylaws to do so.
- Elections will be held earlier in the Spring this year.
- Plan to submit changes to bylaws/constitution as completed vs. presenting all changes at one time.

Meeting adjourned.

College of Natural Sciences Committees

Student Grade Appeal Panel – 1 position (2018-2020, tenured, tenure-track) Chris Gentry

Hi Sylvia,

I am interested in serving on the **Student** Appeal **Grade** Panel. I am a faculty member in the Kinesiology Department under the umbrella of the College of Natural Sciences. I believe that the **Student Grade** Appeal Panel is very important to ensure that the **students** are given the correct **grade**. Such a panel provides some closure when agreement is not achieved between a faculty member and a **student**. I am a former K-12 physical educator and sought to become a physical education teacher education professor because of a passion for teaching. I believe that my effort to provide an objective point of view would be valuable to this panel.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Chris Gentry

Chris Gentry, Ph.D

At Large

Search Committee for Associate VP and Dean of Students – 1 position (tenured, tenure-track faculty) Salome Mshigeni, Christina Hassija

I would like to serve on the Associate Vice President/Dean of Students Search Committee.

I recently served on the search committee for the Associate Vice Provost for Research search committee in 2017. I also am the faculty director of the Office of Student Research and am familiar with relevant campus initiatives and student needs on campus.

Please let me know if you require further information.

Best,

Christina M. Hassija, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology

And

Salome Mshigeni

Greetings,

I would like to join the search committee for either 1 of the following:

Search Committee for VP for Student Affairs – 1 position (tenured, tenure track faculty)

Search Committee for Associate VP and Dean of Students – 1 position (tenured, tenure-track faculty)

Search Committee for Director of Financial Aid – 1 position (tenured, tenure-track faculty)

IT Governance Executive Committee – 1 positions (tenured faculty)

Please let me know if there is still availability.

Thank you so much,

Salome Kapella Mshigeni, PhD, MPH, MPA

**POLICY STATEMENT FOR FACULTY AND STAFF FEEDBACK DURING PERIODIC
REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS' VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC
AFFAIRS/PROVOST, CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS AND COLLEGE DEANS
FAM XXX**

1. Purpose

The Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, Central Administrators and College Deans are evaluated annually by their respective managers in the following categories: budget, strategic planning goals, human resources and other priorities set forth by the division/unit. In addition, every three years a 360 review is completed on these administrators to further develop their leadership skills.

Central Administrators to be reviewed are those who work most directly with faculty and include the Deputy Provost, Associate Provosts, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Extended and Global Education, the Dean of the Palm Desert Campus as well as other positions that may be deemed applicable in the future.

While administrators serve at the pleasure of the President, faculty and staff input is an important part of the evaluation process. As such, the appointing power will seek input from faculty and staff in the division and/or unit as part of the review process.

2. Scheduling

During the 360 review process, which occurs every three years, the Provost and every Central Administrator and College Dean shall include an evaluation by faculty and staff. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations Title V, Article 2.2, the appointing power is responsible for the development and execution of evaluations. Working in partnership with the Department of Human Resources, scheduling and execution of the review of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall be the responsibility of the President. Scheduling and execution of the reviews of the Central Administrators and College Deans shall be incumbent upon the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.

3. Faculty and Staff Feedback

The respective evaluator or a human resources designee will seek feedback from applicable faculty and staff during the review process via an online questionnaire. The resulting information will provide helpful feedback to both the evaluator and the individual being reviewed.

4. Areas of Evaluation

The evaluation questionnaire will include the following five competencies: (1) Student Relationships, (2) Faculty Relationships, (3) Staff Relationships, (4) Leadership Abilities, and (5) Advancement of University's Mission. A blank text box will be included under each subheading for the respondent to comment.

5. Confidentiality

Confidentiality is a major consideration. While faculty and staff comments will be shared with the administrator being evaluated, responses and comments will be reported in the aggregate and thus will not be attributed to an individual. Confidentiality will be further ensured through the use of Qualtrics' "Anonymous Link" feature, which eliminates the capturing of identifying information.

6. Results Use and Distribution

Once complete, faculty and staff perceptions of the administrator being evaluated will be used as part of the evaluation process and shared with the individual being reviewed.

POLICY CONCERNING PERIODIC REVIEW OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS FAM 256

1. Purpose

Periodic reviews of the Academic Affairs Central Administrators are designed to appraise the administrator's leadership, conduct of office including management of subsidiary administrative offices, establishment of objectives and attainment of administrative goals. Those Academic Affairs Central Administrators to be reviewed are those who deal most directly with the faculty and includes but not necessarily limited to Associate Vice Presidents, Associate Provosts, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, the Dean of Extended Education, the Dean of the Palm Desert Campus, as well as any other position which may be deemed related in the future. The review process shall represent a cooperative effort by representatives from faculty, students, staff and administration. These periodic reviews are regarded as constructive and are designed to maintain a sense of collegiality among all persons directly involved with the office being reviewed.

2. Scheduling

Scheduling of all periodic reviews of Academic Affairs Central Administrators shall be the responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.

An initial periodic review of the Academic Affairs Central Administrators shall occur after three years of service. Thereafter, a periodic review shall normally occur every five years unless an early review is called for by special request.

Special requests for reviews shall be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost. Circumstances warranting a special request must be compelling. Special requests shall be made in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost and shall state clearly and in detail the specific reason(s) for the request.

3. Review Panel

3.1 General Provisions

The review panel shall consist of seven or eight members who shall be representative of the constituencies having a direct relationship with the Academic Affairs Central Administrator under review. Other Academic Affairs Central Administrators may be consulted.

3.2 Panel Selection

- 3.2.1 Five tenured faculty members, one from each College shall be elected. Elections officers shall conduct the election of these members. Elections shall be held in a timely fashion.
- 3.2.2 In the case of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, or the Dean of the Palm Desert Campus, one student, undergraduate or graduate, who shall be a full-time student during the period in which the review takes place. This student shall be selected by the Academic Affairs Central Administrator who is to be reviewed from a list of at least two submitted by the President of the Associated Student Body.
- 3.2.3 One non-academic staff member who has permanent status within the University, who has a position within the Division of Academic Affairs, and who has a direct working relationship that is not immediately subordinate to the administrator under review. This member shall be selected by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost from a list of three submitted by the Academic Affairs Central Administrator to be reviewed.
- 3.2.4 The Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost may appoint additional members of the review panel to reflect such concerns as, but not limited to, community interests, diversity goals, or specific program constituencies.
- 3.2.5 Regardless of the size of the final committee, the majority of members shall be from the academic community.

4. Charge to the Review Panel

- 4.1 The review panel shall consider the performance of the Academic Affairs Central Administrator in the context of the diverse activities of the position.

This shall include but may not be limited to the objectives, goals and expectations for leadership and management of the position including the supervisory relationships with subordinates. As part of the review process the panel shall assess the strengths as well as weaknesses of the performance of the Academic Affairs Central Administrator and evaluate that individual's overall effectiveness in terms of relationships with the University as a whole.

4.2 Areas of Evaluation

To assist the review panel in its deliberations, the following items are suggested for consideration. These suggestions should not be taken as limiting, definitive or prescriptive in order. During the process of review, the panel may find areas to be reviewed not specifically noted here. The review panel shall remain free to expand, select from, add to or condense this list of suggestions.

4.2.1 Leadership

Does the Academic Affairs Central Administrator provide effective leadership in her or his primary areas of responsibilities?

4.2.2 Professional Relationships

Does the Academic Affairs Central Administrator maintain effective professional relationships with faculty, students, staff members related to this position, and with the off-campus community as appropriate?

4.2.3 Assigned Tasks

Does the Academic Affairs Central Administrator carry out and complete assigned tasks in a timely and satisfactory manner?

4.2.4 Managerial and Fiscal Skills

Does the Academic Affairs Central Administrator effectively manage the administrative affairs of this office with respect to planning, fiscal matters and personnel?

5. Review Panel Procedures

5.1 The first meeting of the review panel shall be called by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost. At this meeting, the review panel shall elect its chairperson.

5.2 The review panel shall proceed as follows:

5.2.1 Request the Central Administrator under review to prepare and submit a self-study document. The self-study should include the following:

- (a) A listing and brief discussion of primary areas of administrative responsibility. Specific references should be made to goals established at the time of appointment or following subsequent reviews and notes of changes mutually agreed upon with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.
- (b) A listing and brief discussion of the most significant achievements as a Central Administrator since appointment or last review.
- (c) A listing and brief discussion of major goals for the unit during the next five years.
- (d) A listing and brief discussion of administrative strengths which relate to administrative responsibilities.
- (e) A listing and brief discussion of competencies which the Central Administrator would like to strengthen or develop.
- (f) A response to prior review committee recommendations.

5.2.2 Request the Central Administrator to identify constituencies that should be surveyed or contacted as the review committee deems desirable.

5.2.3 Prepare and distribute a survey instrument to these constituencies as appropriate. The survey instrument should include questions that relate to the Central Administrator's primary areas of responsibility.
See Attachment A for a sample survey instrument.

5.2.4 Announce to these constituencies the schedule for personal interviews and open forums, and announce that signed written statements are also acceptable.

5.2.5 Interview the Central Administrator and provide to her or him the opportunity to discuss with the panel any major issues or specific concerns which may have arisen during the review process and to provide any additional information needed by the Panel.

6. The Report, its Use and Distribution:

6.1 The review panel shall prepare a written report which shall contain the following:

- (a) An executive summary.
- (b) An analysis of the Central Administrator's self-study.
- (c) An analysis of the survey results.
- (d) An analysis of all other information obtained from open forums, interviews, and written statements.
- (e) A comparison of accomplishments to goals.
- (f) Recommendations concerning changes the Central Administrator should undertake with respect to all of the areas evaluated in Section 4.2. Additional recommendations may be made concerning the Central Administrator's office organizational structure; functions undertaken in the Central Administrator's office; budgetary, personnel and other processes; and any other relevant issues.

6.2 The review panel shall then meet with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost University to present and discuss the report. Upon acceptance of the report by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, the review panel's work shall be completed. However, the panel may be called upon for clarification of portions of the report that may not be clear.

6.3 Following this meeting and discussion, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall provide a copy of the report to the Academic Affairs Central Administrator.

6.4 After review of the report, and within a reasonable period of time, the Vice

President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall meet with the Academic Affairs Central Administrator and discuss the findings of the review panel and the specific recommendations.

Attachment A

SAMPLE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Does the Central Administrator:

1. *provide effective leadership in his/her primary areas of responsibility?*
2. *maintain effective professional relationships with faculty, students, staff members related to the position, and with the off-campus community as appropriate?*
3. *carry out and complete assigned tasks in a timely and satisfactory manner?*
4. *effectively manage the administrative affairs of the office with respect to planning, fiscal matters and personnel?*
5. *encourage a collegial environment for decision making?*
6. *operate within established university policies, procedures, and expectations?*
7. *support diversity in personnel matters?*
8. *represent the university effectively outside the university?*
9. *manage an efficient and professional office?*
10. *maintain currency in knowledge of respective areas of responsibility?*

These questions may be modified as appropriate and additional questions added to address issues specific to the primary functions of the central administrator being reviewed.

Responses to these queries may consist of marking one of the following categories: **strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, or not enough information.**

**POLICY STATEMENT CONCERNING
PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/PROVOST
FAM 650.7**

1. Purpose

Periodic reviews of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost are designed to appraise the administrator's leadership, conduct of office including management of subsidiary administrative offices, establishment of objectives and attainment of academic and administrative goals. The review process shall represent a cooperative effort by representatives from faculty, students, staff and administration. These periodic reviews are regarded as constructive and are designed to maintain a sense of collegiality among all persons directly involved with the office being reviewed.

2. Scheduling

Scheduling of all periodic reviews of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall be the responsibility of the Office of the President of the University.

An initial periodic review of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall occur after three years of service. Thereafter, a periodic review shall normally occur every five years unless an early review is called for by special request.

Special requests for reviews shall be approved by the President of the University. Circumstances warranting a special request must be compelling. Special requests shall be made in writing to the President of the University and shall state clearly and in detail the specific reason(s) for the request.

3. Review Panel

3.1 General Provisions

The review panel shall consist of at least eight members who shall be representative of the constituents having a direct relationship with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.

The review panel shall be assisted in an active consultative role by the five College Deans and the Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Personnel and Academic Programs. At the discretion of the review panel, other members of the University community may be consulted.

3.2 Panel Selection

3.2.1 Five tenured faculty members, one from each College shall be elected. Elections officers shall conduct the elections of these members.

Elections must be held in a timely fashion and may not take longer than three weeks.

3.2.2 One administrative representative from this campus shall be appointed by the President of the University. This member shall be selected from a list of at least two nominees submitted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost who is to be reviewed. This member must be an area administrator.

3.2.3 One student, undergraduate or graduate, who shall be a full-time student during the period in which the review takes place. This member shall be selected by the President from a list of at least two nominees submitted by the President of the Associated Student Body.

3.2.4 One non-academic staff member who has permanent status within the University and must have a position which is related to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost. This member shall be selected by the President of the University from a list of three nominees submitted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost to be reviewed.

3.2.5 The President of the University may appoint additional members to the review panel to reflect such concerns as, but not limited to, community interest, diversity goals or specific program constituencies.

If additional members are appointed to the review panel, the final composition normally shall consist of a majority of faculty members, and the total size of the committee shall not exceed 11 members.

4. Charge to the Review Panel

4.1 Review

The review panel shall consider the performance of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost in the context of the broad range of the diverse activities of the position. This shall include but may not be limited to the objectives, goals and expectations for leadership and management of the position including the supervisory relationships with the Colleges and any subsidiary offices. As part of the review process the panel shall assess the strengths as well as weaknesses of the performance of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost and evaluate that individual's overall effectiveness in terms of relationships with the University as a whole.

4.2 Areas of Evaluation

To assist the review panel in its deliberations, the following items are suggested for consideration. During the process of review, the panel may find areas to be reviewed not specifically noted here. The review panel shall remain free to expand on this list of suggestions.

4.2.1 Leadership

Does the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost provide effective leadership in the following areas: faculty recruitment, development and evaluation; student retention; curriculum development; educational equity and diversity programs; and in any other areas related to leadership skills required of this position?

4.2.2 Professional Relationships

Does the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost maintain effective professional relationships with faculty, students, staff members related to this position, and with the off-campus community?

4.2.3 Supervision Skills

Does the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost provide effective supervision of the following: College deans, staff of the Office of Academic Affairs, and subsidiary offices, such as Dean of Extended Education, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, and the Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Personnel and Academic Programs?

Other positions under the directions of this office, which may be added in the future, shall also be included.

4.2.4 Managerial and Fiscal Skills

Does the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost effectively manage the administrative affairs of this office with respect to planning, fiscal matters and personnel?

5. Review Panel Procedures

- 5.1 The First meeting of the review panel shall be called by the President of the University. At this meeting, the review panel shall elect its chairperson.
- 5.2 The review panel shall assemble the following items: the published job description of the office, any available data or materials which define the responsibilities of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, descriptive statements of the relationship between the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost and any subsidiary offices solicited from the holders of the subsidiary office, and a self-study solicited from the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost. These materials shall be solicited from the appropriate persons and a deadline for their receipt shall be given.
- 5.3 The review panel shall ensure that all members of the University community who are directly involved with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, are represented by members of the review panel, shall be given the opportunity to communicate with the panel. These shall include faculty, students, staff, and administrators.
- 5.4 The means whereby the members of the University community communicate with the review panel shall be determined by the panel. Written statements, personal interviews, and open forums may be employed.
- 5.5 The review panel shall provide the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost and opportunity to discuss with the panel any major issues which may arise and any specific concerns identified during the review process.

6. The Report, Its Use and Distribution

- 6.1 The review panel shall prepare a written report which shall contain a description of the review process, of the data collected, and of the solicited materials including results of the interviews. The report shall include specific recommendations for future action by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.
- 6.2 The review panel shall then meet with the President of the University to present and discuss the report.
- 6.3 After this discussion, a copy of the report shall be presented to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.
- 6.4 Upon acceptance of the report, and within a reasonable period of time, the President of the University shall meet with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provosts to discuss the findings of the review panel and the specific recommendations.

POLICY CONCERNING PERIODIC REVIEW OF COLLEGE DEANS FAM 651.3

1. Purpose

Periodic reviews of College Deans are designed to renew the understandings among the various constituencies of a College regarding a Dean's leadership, conduct of office, establishment of objectives and attainment of administrative goals. The review process shall represent a cooperative effort by representatives from faculty, students, staff and administration. These periodic reviews are regarded as constructive and are designed to maintain a sense of collegiality among all persons directly involved with the Dean being reviewed.

2. Scheduling

Scheduling of all periodic reviews of College Deans shall be the responsibility of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Periodic Review: An initial periodic review of a College Dean shall occur after three years of service. Thereafter, a periodic review shall normally occur every five years unless an early review is called for by special request.

Early Review: An early review of a college dean can occur at any time during the term of the dean. An early review can be called for in two ways. First, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost may call for a review of any college dean at any time. Secondly, a college faculty may request an early review of their dean using the following procedure:

a. Faculty members may write a letter to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost requesting an early review of the dean. The letter must include the reasons or rationale for holding the review at this time and the signatures of over 20% faculty members of the college faculty making the request.

Note: A faculty member may only sign one letter in any academic calendar year.

b. Within thirty (30) days of receiving the letter, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, after having conferred with the dean to obtain the dean's version

of the facts, will respond in writing to the faculty members as to why or why not the review will move forward.

c. If the request for review is not granted, the faculty members may appeal to the Faculty Senate by requesting that a vote be taken by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the dean's college.

d. The Chair of the Faculty Senate will contact the University Elections Officer to conduct the election. Note: If the University Elections Officer resides in the college in question, the Chair of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Senate's Executive Committee shall appoint an Elections Officer to conduct the election. The election officer will have 45 days to complete the election.

e. If over 50% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the college vote in favor of holding an early review, the review will proceed. It should be noted that an eligible faculty member who does not vote will be counted as a no vote for the early review.

3. Review Panel

3.1 General Provisions

The review panel shall consist of eight (8) members (A chair from outside the college and seven (7) members, who shall be representative of the constituencies within the college).

The Associate Vice President for Personnel and Academic Programs and other appropriate Academic Affairs administrative personnel, may serve as resource persons for the review panel. At the discretion of the review panel, other members of the university community maybe consulted.

3.2 Panel Selection

3.2.1 The Chair of the panel will be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost from outside the college. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the review panel and Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost to conduct the review in accordance with this policy. If at any time, there should be a procedural concern, a report may be submitted to the Chair of the review panel and Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost.

3.2.2 Five tenured faculty members elected from the College whose Dean is to be reviewed. No more than one faculty member shall be elected from each department/school. However, if there are fewer than five departments in a college, department(s) with largest number of faculty may elect two tenured faculty members as needed to assure that five

tenured faculty members are elected. If any elections are not completed within forty-five (45) days, the remaining members of the committee shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee from a list of nominees from those departments/schools whose elections were not completed.

3.2.3 One student, undergraduate or graduate, majoring in a subject offered within the College whose Dean is to be reviewed. Each Department Chair may forward the name of a student in their major to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, along with a brief explanation why the student was selected. From these student candidates the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost will make the final selection.

3.2.4 One non-academic staff member who has permanent status within the College whose Dean is to be reviewed and who has a working relationship that is not directly subordinate to the Dean. This member shall be selected by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost from a list of all eligible staff members in the college.

4. Charge to the Review Panel

4.1 General Provisions

The review panel shall consider the broad range of diverse educational philosophies within the College and its constituent departments; interpret the objectives, goals and expectations for leadership and management within the constituencies of the College; assess the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the performance of the Dean in the role of the principal administrator of the College; and evaluate the overall effectiveness of the operation of the College as well as its relationship with the university as a whole. The review panel shall conduct the evaluation in a fair and equitable manner. All members of the committee must reveal if they have a conflict of interest with the dean in question and shall recuse themselves from the committee if one is disclosed. In the end, it is the committee's responsibility to conduct a fair and unbiased review of the dean in question.

4.2 Areas of Evaluation

To assist the review panel in its deliberations, the following items are suggested for consideration. These suggestions should not be taken as limiting, definitive or prescriptive in order. During the process of review, the panel may find areas to be reviewed not specifically noted here. The review panel shall remain free to expand, select from, add to or condense this list of suggestions.

4.2.1 Leadership

Does the Dean foster confidence, trust and respect in the area of leadership? Considerations here might include such items as availability for assistance and consultation, fairness and honesty in dealing with problems, resolution of conflicts, and other items of a general nature related to leadership.

4.2.2 Fiscal Management

Does the Dean maintain the fiscal affairs of the College in an appropriate manner and keep the faculty informed of the same? Considerations here might include items such as preparation and maintenance of the budget, allocation of funds, appropriate purchases and/or repair of equipment, handling of special money allocations, and other items related to the business of the College.

4.2.3 Instruction

Does the Dean maintain appropriate curriculum standards within the College? Considerations here might include items such as establishment of appropriate educational policies, assistance in curriculum development, quality control of instruction, and other items related to curriculum and instruction.

4.2.4 Faculty Relationships

Does the Dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with the instructional faculty within the College? Considerations here might include items such as consultative and collegial decision making, performance reviews or periodic evaluations, recruiting practices, concern regarding the issue of diversity, handling of problems and complaints, committee work, assistance in faculty development such as grants and assigned time, and other items related to the instructional faculty of the College.

4.2.5 Student Relationships

Does the Dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with students? Considerations here might include items such as resolution of registration problems and practices, acceptable handling of complaints, involvement in outreach programs, involvement in student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, availability for advisement and consultation, and other items appropriately related to students.

4.2.6 Staff Relationships

Does the Dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with the members of the non-academic staff of the College?

Considerations here might include items such as recruiting practices, concern regarding the issue of diversity, appropriate work assignments, recognition of job performance, disciplinary or removal procedures, and other items related to non-academic staff.

4.2.7 **Administrative Items**

Does the Dean handle the administrative affairs of the College in an appropriately professional manner? Consideration here might be items such as relationships with Department Chairpersons/School Directors, interactions with other Deans or University and/or Central Administrators, and other items which are related to the administration of the College.

4.2.8 **Office Management**

Does the Dean maintain a current knowledge of relevant policies and procedures, follow them appropriately, and carry out day-to-day functions of the office in an orderly and organized manner. This includes, but is not limited to, the office organizational structure, allocation of responsibilities to the support staff and associate dean, etc.

5. Review Panel Procedures

5.1 The first meeting of the review panel shall be called by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.

5.2 The review panel shall proceed as follows:

5.2.1 Request a self-study document from the College Dean under review. The self-study should include the following:

- (a) A listing and brief discussion of primary areas of administrative responsibility. Specific references should be made to goals established at the time of appointment or following subsequent reviews and notes of changes mutually agreed upon with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.
- (b) A listing and brief discussion of the most significant achievements as a College Dean since appointment or last review.
- (c) A listing and brief discussion of major goals for the College during the next five years.
- (d) A listing and brief discussion of administrative strengths which

relate to administrative responsibilities.

(e) A listing and brief discussion of competencies which the College Dean would like to strengthen or develop.

(f) A response to prior review committee recommendations.

5.2.2 Request the College Dean to identify constituencies that should be surveyed or contacted as the review committee deems desirable.

5.2.3 Prepare and distribute a survey instrument to these constituencies as appropriate. The survey instrument should include questions that relate to the College Dean's primary areas of responsibility. See Attachment A for a sample survey instrument.

5.2.4 Announce to these constituencies the schedule for personal interviews and open forums, and announce that signed written statements are also acceptable.

5.2.5 Interview the College Dean and provide to him or her an opportunity to discuss with the panel any major issues which may have arisen or any specific concerns identified during the review process.

6. The Report, Its Use and Distribution

6.1 The review panel shall prepare a written report which shall contain the following:

- (a) An executive summary.
- (b) An analysis of the College Dean's self-study.
- (c) An analysis of the survey results.
- (d) An analysis of all other information obtained from open forums, interviews, and written statements.
- (e) A comparison of accomplishments to goals.
- (f) Recommendations concerning changes the College Dean should undertake with respect to all of the areas evaluated in Section 4.2. Additional recommendations may be made concerning the College Dean's office organizational structure; functions undertaken in the College Dean's office; budgetary, personnel and other processes; and any other relevant issues.

6.2 The review panel shall then meet with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost to present and discuss the report. Upon acceptance of the report

by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, the review panel's work shall be completed. However, the panel may be called upon for clarification of portions of the report that may not be clear.

6.3 Following this meeting and discussion, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall provide a copy of the report to the College Dean.

6.4 After review of the report and within 10 calendar days after receipt of the report, the College Dean may submit a response to the report addressing the evaluation. The response will be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost. A copy of the response from the Dean will be shared with the review panel and the committee will meet with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost to discuss the response and revisions may be made to the report by the review panel, if necessary. Upon acceptance of the review panel report (including revisions, if any), the review panel's work shall be completed. However, they may be called upon for clarification if portions of that report may not be clear.

6.5 The Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall meet with the College Dean to discuss the findings of the review panel and the specific recommendations.

6.6 The Dean shall prepare a five-year plan in response to her or his discussions with the Vice President/Provost regarding the review panel's findings and recommendations.

6.7 The Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost shall then arrange a meeting with the faculty, staff and students of the College whose Dean has been reviewed. In addition, the executive summary of the review panel will be circulated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost to the College. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the findings and recommendations of the review panel. The form which this meeting takes shall be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost but shall ensure that a spectrum of the members including faculty, students, staff, administrators and others directly involved with the Dean may attend. At this time, copies of a summary of the report and the Dean's plan shall be made available to the faculty, staff, and students of the College. Copies of the report, the response (if any), and plan shall be available in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost.

Attachment A

SAMPLE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Does the College Dean:

1. *make personnel decisions that improve the quality of faculty in the College?*
2. *provide leadership in promoting promising educational innovations?*
3. *provide leadership in encouraging the recruiting of competent and productive faculty?*
4. *encourage a collegial environment for decision making?*
5. *establish good working relationships with faculty, staff, students, and external constituencies?*
6. *provide assistance to faculty in securing external resources?*
7. *encourage the development of effective teaching, research, and service?*
8. *make herself/himself accessible to the faculty?*
9. *provide for faculty participation in making major decisions?*
10. *maintain appropriate professional relationship with the staff personnel?*
11. *represent the interests of the College's faculty to the university administration in a manner consistent with the overall interests of the university?*
12. *explain the rationale for major decisions which do not follow faculty recommendations?*
13. *communicate clearly university policies, procedures, and expectations that affect the faculty?*
14. *operate within established policies, procedures, and expectations?*
15. *allocate human and support resources wisely?*
16. *support diversity in personnel matters?*
17. *represent the university effectively to external audiences?*
18. *manage an efficient and professional College dean's office?*
19. *work to develop effective plans for the College?*
20. *make priority decisions for the development of the College?*

These questions may be modified and additional questions added as appropriate to address issues specific to the primary functions of the College Dean.

Responses to these queries may consist of marking one of the following categories: **strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, or not enough information.**