

Appendix A: Review and Evaluation of Deans

INTRODUCTION

The University is committed to fostering the success of its deans and enhancing their effectiveness in a constructive way. Performance reviews are a means to support this commitment and are the responsibility of the appropriate responsible administrator. The administrative policy: *Performance Reviews for Academic Professional and Academic Employees* mandates assessment of administrators, including deans, in a relatively uniform fashion. Responsible administrators are expected to conduct and budget for appropriate performance reviews and will be held accountable for doing so.

The following review procedures are applicable specifically to the review of deans (including academic vice chancellors). The process accomplishes the following:

- Supports both developmental and evaluative outcomes;
- Supports the broad goals of leadership excellence and managerial accountability; and
- Allows for efficient use of resources.

The review and evaluation of deans includes both an evaluative and developmental component. The evaluative review incorporates use of a standardized web-based survey comprised of a common core of items. The developmental review is a 360-degree web-based process with follow-up coaching.

DESCRIPTION OF CORE PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The following five *performance criteria* have been identified as central to positions of leadership at the University. These core criteria are incorporated into the standard survey instrument designed to support the three-year evaluation for deans. *It is recommended that the responsible administrator share this set of core performance criteria during the interview and subsequent hiring process for new deans, and during subsequent annual performance discussions.*

Leadership

- frames a shared vision of the University as a public research university
- thinks globally and locally
- exhibits forward thinking
- focuses on short and long term goals
- structures strategic plans
- shows integrity
- challenges and inspires
- demonstrates ability to motivate people
- exercises independent judgment
- demonstrates a willingness to critically assess personal strengths and effectively recognizes and utilizes strengths of line and staff personnel to accomplish unit and University objectives
- maintains credibility
- serves as a role model for managing/balancing personal and professional values and activities in life
- demonstrates ability to do fundraising
- enhances community
- places emphasis on building and supporting a diverse workforce
- exhibits ethical behavior
- supports and advances the University's strategic plan
- supports policies, procedures, and directives of the President and/or Board of Regents

Commitment to Diversity

- exhibits respect for all
- fosters an environment that seeks understanding and respect of al

- exercises leadership on issues of diversity
- manages differences with skill and sensitivity
- exhibits respect for all
- demonstrates effective recruitment, retention and promotion of historically underrepresented constituencies
- takes personal responsibility for responding to affirmative action goals
- seeks understanding of self and others in an effort to facilitate people working together

Management

- demonstrates knowledge of and commitment to the mission and culture of a leading public research university
- empowers and involves others
- mentors staff and faculty in their tasks
- carries through on review for administrators and monitors adherence to review policies for all employees in unit
- facilitates and manages change and progress
- focuses on objectives and results
- supports quality initiatives and efforts – “continuous improvement”
- delegates tasks and authority effectively
- manages human, financial and physical resources to increase unit and organizational effectiveness
- exhibits decisiveness in actions to execute strategic plans
- plans and organizes effectively
- demonstrates effective problem-solving skills
- maintains personal clarity and work direction when faced with ambiguity
- demonstrates knowledge of federal, state and institutional rules, regulations, policies and procedures and ensures compliance
- gives priority to own and other’s professional development by encouraging and supporting participation and/or sponsoring activities
- perseveres under difficult situations
- demonstrates ability to guide an effective operational team that balances strengths and weaknesses
- actively brings people together as a team to accomplish goals
- treats staff equitably and fairly

Functional Competence

- demonstrates necessary knowledge, skill and understanding to carry out the responsibilities of the position in support of the mission of the University, and as stated in the job description
- gets things done in a timely and efficient way
- operates efficiently
- carries out effectively specific position responsibilities within the context of a leading public research university

Interpersonal Skills

- develops and maintains smooth, effective working relationship with people and groups within the unit and from other parts of the organization
- works effectively as part of a team, in partnership and with individuals
- recognizes expertise and makes use of thought, ideas and information from others
- listens actively and acknowledges communication
- communicates effectively in speaking and in writing, both internally and externally
- establishes rapport and puts individuals and groups at ease through use of appropriate humor, effective listening skills, acceptance of diverse ideas and differing points of view
- maintains objectivity and demonstrates effective conflict resolution skills
- works effectively with outside organizations

Additional Criteria

- as identified by the responsible administrator in consultation with the dean being reviewed

CONFIDENTIALITY OF ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

All persons from whom evaluations are solicited should be informed that in conformance with the state's Data Practices Act, certain evaluations may be accessible for review by the dean being reviewed.

Identification of the source of assessment information increases the validity and credibility of the performance review. Review participants are to identify themselves to enable better use of their assessment information. On the other hand, occasionally people under the direct control and authority of the dean being reviewed have concerns with being identified as the source of comments. For these direct reports, identification is not required. Identification is also not required by students who participate. **Participants in the review should be informed as to whether or not their assessment information is required to carry identification and in what manner.** The responsible administrator in consultation with the General Counsel's Office, when needed, is to make final determinations where it is not clear whether the assessment information provided is to be attributed or protected. In circumstances where participants would have reasons for concern, the information requested could be protected. The University will not consider surveys or letters of evaluation submitted anonymously by indirect reports or external reviewers.

If any information is received relative to allegations of serious misconduct or illegal action, whether the source is identified or not, the responsible administrator is charged with determining what, if any, investigation is appropriate.

Deans being reviewed shall be held to the strictest standards of professional and ethical behavior and are to not retaliate against any person who has participated in the review process, retaliation including any form of intimidation or harassment. Responsible administrators should bring this expectation to the attention of the dean being reviewed.

Response verification. Because the survey given to University respondents is web-based, the X.500 numbers of survey recipients are provided to the Office of Measurement Services (OMS) who then delivers the survey to the selected people. OMS will verify that survey responses received are from authorized reviewers by matching the X.500 number of the respondent with the overall list.

Direct reports, such as collegiate department chairs/heads or an "assistant to" are not required to have their survey responses identified beyond the match as an authorized respondent. Once the data is aggregated and summarized, any linkages between the X.500 and the individual survey will be destroyed. These are individuals whose work is appreciably affected by the deans being reviewed and includes such actions as hiring, performance reviews, and salary decisions.

Indirect reports, such as collegiate office staff not reporting directly to the dean being reviewed, must have their survey responses identified. These are generally individuals whose work could moderately be affected by the dean being reviewed.

Student reviewers, are not required to have their survey responses identified beyond the match as an authorized respondent. Once the data is aggregated and summarized, any linkages between the X.500 and the individual survey will be destroyed.

External reviewers, such as alumni, advisory board members, donors, legislators and community individuals, must have evaluative comments attributed.

THREE-YEAR EVALUATION OF DEANS

The Three-Year Evaluation is broad in scope and dimension. Three appraisal elements contribute to this evaluation:

- (a) annual reviews that have occurred since the last multiple-source or three-year evaluation;
- (b) the responsible administrator's personal observations and gathering of feedback over time; and
- (c) results of a standardized survey in which assessment information is solicited from multiple reviewers internal to the University, along with assessment comments from external reviewers.

Done well, the three year evaluation provides a reliable and valid overall view of the dean's performance including accomplishments, expertise, professional growth, and both a general and specific assessment of effectiveness in carrying out the responsibilities of the position.

Multiple-Source Assessment

A. Purpose

The purpose of this multiple-source assessment is three-fold:

- (a) to provide evaluation feedback from a wide spectrum of people, both internal and external to the University community, who are affected by the individual's performance;
- (b) to inform decisions regarding future work plans, as well as decisions of reappointment; and
- (c) to develop group norms over time, and in so doing gain a better understanding of areas where focused development efforts are needed.

B. Methodology

Assessment data shall be sought from both internal to the University faculty, staff and administrators and external constituents.

- (a) **For internal to the University reviewers, a standardized web-based survey shall be used.** Questions included in the survey address the five performance criteria (leadership, commitment to diversity, management, functional competence and interpersonal skills) as defined under "Description of Core Performance Criteria." A small set of three to five open-ended questions addressing additional criteria specific to the dean being reviewed may be developed and added to the standardized survey.
- (b) **For external to the University reviewers, evaluative comment shall be requested through a letter.** The letter includes a short series of standardized open-ended questions with the addition of up to three additional questions relevant to the external reviewers' knowledge of the work of the dean being reviewed.

C. Initiation of the Review

The responsible administrator shall inform the dean to be reviewed that a Three-Year Evaluation is being initiated. The responsible administrator shall schedule a meeting with the dean and is expected to cover the following **discussion points**:

- Communications planned around the review, including announcement of the review and how and to whom the results of the review will be shared;
- The intent of the review to include:
 - Identifying performance strengths as well as areas of concern; and
 - Noting that the multiple-source assessment is one important element of several used in making a reappointment decision.
- The five core performance criteria on which the dean will be reviewed within the multiple-source assessment, as well as any additional criteria to be evaluated;
- A request for the dean's assistance in identifying potential reviewers, both inside and outside the University:

- Reviewers within the University but not within the College, student leaders, and people external to the University from whom assessment information should be requested, and/or
- Individuals who may be helpful in identifying other potential reviewers,
- An outline of the process and projected timelines;
- An opportunity for the dean to discuss any specific circumstance that might prove important in which insight into the context of the situation may be helpful and should be taken into account throughout the review process; may include factors potentially viewed as problematic.
- **A Performance Background Statement**, that will be distributed to the members of the review committee, shall be requested from the dean. This statement should include the following:
 - Job description and current responsibilities;
 - Administrative philosophy;
 - Priorities over the time period since the dean's last multiple-source review;
 - Major activities and significant contributions since the dean's last multiple-source review;
 - Current top issues;
 - Statement addressing what has been supportive in getting the job done and what has impeded ability to do so; and
 - Future plans/goals;
- The right of the dean to review the official Three-Year Evaluation File following the conclusion of the review, and to submit written information to the official Three-Year Evaluation File to supplement or refute materials contained therein;
- A reminder to the dean that they will be held to the strictest standards of professional and ethical behavior and to not retaliate against any person who has participated in the review process, retaliation including any form of intimidation or harassment; and
- An opportunity for the dean to ask questions and raise further points of discussion.

D. Multiple-Source Assessment Process

The internal to the University web-based survey will be delivered and managed by the Office of Measurement Services (OMS). The letters requesting evaluative comment from external reviewers will be sent by the responsible administrator. The Office of Human Resources will summarize assessment data from the letters. OMS is then charged with the responsibility of compiling the summary results of the standardized survey and letters of evaluation in a report for the responsible administrator.

This multiple-source assessment is to be conducted following three-year intervals as one part of the Three-Year Evaluation. The timing of the review is critical to its effectiveness. The survey often involves assessment information from faculty, and therefore in most cases should not be initiated during the months of April through August, due to generally poor response rates from faculty at this time of year. Participants will have three weeks to respond to the survey or return letters of evaluation.

The Three-Year Evaluation from start to completion is to take no more than a semester. This allows for (a) sufficient lead-time for OMS to prepare for the web delivery of the survey, (b) for administration to identify and categorize internal participants in the review for confidentiality purposes, (c) for the responsible administrator to generate any additional questions for the web-based survey for internal reviewers or the standardized letter of evaluation sent to external reviewers, (d) for responses of the multiple-source assessment to be gathered and analyzed, and (e) for the responsible administrator to assimilate all factors to consider in the final Three-Year Evaluation and communicate in writing the evaluation outcomes to the dean being reviewed.

Steps in the Process

Step 1: <i>(July 1 every year)</i>	Office of Human Resources notifies the appropriate senior vice president that Three-Year Evaluation reviews should take place within their respective areas during the academic year.
Step 2: <i>Week 1</i>	Office of Human Resources , working with the responsible administrator or designee, reviews list of faculty and staff who are a part of the dean's unit and determines direct and

	indirect reports for purposes of attribution of survey responses; provides needed information (e.g., direct and indirect report lists with X.500 numbers, review/survey time line) to the Office of Measurement Services, (OMS) at the end of week 1.
Step 3: <i>Week 1</i>	Responsible Administrator notifies the dean of the review, requests the preparation of a Performance Background Statement and other information, and sets date for meeting.
Step 4: <i>Week 3</i>	Responsible Administrator meets with the dean being reviewed to (a) provide information concerning the evaluation review, (b) identify others within the University with whom the dean interacts in a significant way, (c) identify student leaders with whom the dean interacts, (d) review list of possible external reviewers and make further suggestions, (e) discuss the information contained in the Performance Background Statement, (f) discuss factors that may be important to consider or which may be viewed as problematic in the review and to gain insight into the context of such situations.
Step 5: <i>Week 3</i>	Responsible Administrator announces the review to the college, following the meeting outlined in Step 4.
Step 6: <i>Week 5</i>	Responsible Administrator requests participation in the on-campus web-based survey and sends letters requesting evaluative comment from external reviewers.
Step 7: <i>Weeks 6, 7, & 8</i>	Office of Measurement Services collects data from survey responses. A designated person within the Office of Human Resources receives responses from external reviewers.
Step 8: <i>Week 9</i>	Office of Measurement Services summarizes the collected data from the web-based survey and conducts analysis of the survey data. The Office of Human Resources compiles data from external reviewers and transmits to OMS. OMS prepares a written report addressing results from both internal and external reviewers. This report, along with raw data, is forwarded to a designated person within the Office of Human Resources. <i>If information received by OMS includes allegations of serious misconduct or illegal action, OMS will convey that information when noted to the responsible administrator.</i>
Step 9: <i>Weeks 10 & 11</i>	Office of Human Resources distributes the report to the responsible administrator and the appropriate Review Committee who then meet to discuss results of the survey and determine if any further data analysis is needed, the request for such analysis being made to OMS as soon as possible. The responsible administrator and Review Committee also discuss external reviewer comments in this meeting.
Step 10: <i>Week 11</i>	Review Committee meets with the responsible administrator, OHR and OMS to share and discuss outcomes of the report.
Step 11: <i>Week 12</i>	Responsible Administrator provides report to dean under review.
Step 12: <i>Weeks 13 & 14</i>	Responsible Administrator meets with the dean being reviewed to discuss (1) the report and full review; and (2) resources or strategies that will be made available to help address areas needing attention. Notifies the unit that the evaluation has been completed. Submits official file to the Office of Human Resources.
Step 13:	Responsible Administrator prepares final evaluation report.
Step 14: <i>Weeks 14 & 15</i>	Dean Being Reviewed reviews the official Review File at the conclusion of the process, if desired, and may submit written information to the official Three-Year Evaluation File to supplement or refute materials contained therein.
Step 15: <i>Week 15</i>	Dean Being Reviewed is given the opportunity to comment on the evaluation; utilizes information from the evaluation in structuring personal professional development activities and future job activities.

E. Participants in the Multiple-Source Assessment

- (a) The following individuals internal to the University will be given an opportunity to participate in the evaluation by responding to the standardized web-based survey:
- Collegiate faculty and staff;
 - Collegiate student leaders;
 - Peer administrators; and
 - Others as identified.

(b) The following individuals external to the University would be invited through letter to provide evaluative comment:

- Peer administrators such as deans from other higher education institutions; and
- Other external reviewers such as alumni, advisory board members, donors, legislators and community individuals.

Individuals with a conflict of interest with regard to the dean being reviewed should not participate in the review. A conflict of interest occurs when a relationship between two employees could directly or indirectly compromise their professional judgment in carrying out University activities. Examples of conflict of interest are situations described in the Board of Regents Policies: *Conflict of Interest* and *Nepotism and Personal Relationships*.

F. Review Committee

Two small review committees are appointed, one that assists with dean evaluations occurring within the Academic Health Center and one that assists with all other dean evaluations. Members will serve for a period of one to two years. It is suggested that members would include a dean, faculty member and an academic professional and administrative employee, each from a different campus, college or administrative unit. Two additional faculty and/or academic professional or administrative members of the college shall be selected and appointed to the committee by the Provost. One individual is selected from a list of names forwarded to the Provost from the college's faculty or collegiate assembly, and the other one also selected by the Provost "at large."

The appropriate committee shall meet with the senior vice president conducting the evaluation to review the results, suggest further analysis if needed, and track commonalities in review questions and outcomes from different reviews over a different period of time. The committees are also charged with helping to assess the validity and effectiveness of the multiple-source assessment instruments over time.

G. Final Three-Year Evaluation Document

The multiple-source evaluation report prepared by OMS is supplemented by additional evaluation and comment from the responsible administrator. Major accomplishments since the last multiple-source or three-year evaluation are to be included along with an overall summary of administrative strengths and areas that need attention.

H. Official Three-Year Evaluation File

An official Three-Year Evaluation File must be established jointly by the responsible administrator and the Office of Human Resources and shall contain the following information:

- a) Copy of the survey instrument (provided to University reviewers) and the letter of evaluation (sent to external reviewers);
- b) Raw data collected including the disk and the letters of evaluations containing all responses to the web-based survey;
- c) Annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or Three-Year Evaluation;
- d) Report(s) from Office of Measurement Services; and
- e) Final Three-Year Evaluation document from the responsible administrator.

The entire official Three-Year Evaluation File will be available to the dean being reviewed for inspection at the conclusion of the review. The dean being reviewed may submit information to the file to supplement or refute materials contained in this file.

At the conclusion of the review, the official Three-Year Evaluation File will be maintained in the Office of Human Resources and will be held until the next Three-Year Evaluation is completed. A copy of the final Three-Year Evaluation document is maintained in the dean's official personnel file within the Office of Human Resources.

I. Communication at Conclusion of Evaluation

The responsible administrator and dean being reviewed determine how and what will be communicated to the college's faculty and staff regarding the Three-Year Evaluation. *To share summary or other information from the review requires written authorization from the dean being reviewed.*

360-DEGREE ASSESSMENT OF DEANS

The 360-Degree Assessment is a developmental review process which incorporates an optional performance coaching component, the focus of which is determined by the review outcomes. The intent of this review is to provide an opportunity for the dean being reviewed to obtain feedback on areas where leadership development would be of benefit.

360-Degree Instrument

A. Purpose

The purpose of the standardized 360-degree web-based instrument is to assess a dean's capabilities against leadership criteria and in so doing provide valuable developmental feedback from individuals who have opportunity to observe and interact on a regular basis with the dean being reviewed.

B. Methodology

Assessment data is sought from a small group of individuals who rate the dean on key areas of leadership. A standardized web-based tool is used, administered by an outside vendor. The administrator being reviewed selects a group of raters, (minimum of 8, maximum of 15). This group can be chosen from University administrative peers/associates, direct reports, others within the college and the responsible administrator. Raters should be individuals with whom the dean being reviewed generally interacts in conducting the unit's business. In addition to others providing assessment ratings, the dean being reviewed is also to do a self-assessment rating.

C. Frequency and Timing of the Review

The 360-degree assessment is to be scheduled a minimum of once every three years. For deans new to the position, a review of this nature is to be conducted within the first 12 months in the position. Reviews of this nature should occur sometime between September and April.

D. Review Process

An outside vendor administers the 360-degree tool. Results of the assessment are summarized and provided to the dean being reviewed by the vendor. The vendor will provide to the dean being reviewed a copy of the results and will be available to meet to discuss the review. The results of the assessment may be shared with the responsible administrator, as agreed to by the dean and responsible administrator.

E. Optional Coaching

After reviewing the results of the 360-degree assessment, the dean being reviewed may choose to request the use of a coach to assist in addressing areas to be strengthened.