

Academic Affairs Faculty Senate

# 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.