

Resolution to Clarify Handbook Language for Dean Evaluations

Professional Relations Committee

Faculty Senate

Ohio University

Second Reading March 14, 2022

Whereas Ohio University faculty have a home/department and campus affiliation(s),

Whereas Ohio University faculty should be provided an opportunity to evaluation academic deans associated with their home/department and campus affiliations,

Be it resolved that the language of the Faculty Handbook Sections VII.E, VII.E.3 and VII.E.4 be revised as follows:

E. Appointment and Evaluation of Deans and Executive Officers

All sections of the following Board of Trustees policy that deal with the appointment, evaluation, and reappointment/termination of deans are a matter of *Faculty Handbook* policy.

This policy provides for the appointment and evaluation of the major administrative officers of the University, including the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, **Deans (or Dean equivalents) with appointments in academic units with at least five full-time faculty with tenure/promotion homes in the unit, Heritage College of Medicine (HCOM) campus deans, Regional Higher Education campus deans, and the Regional Higher Education Executive Dean.** It outlines regularized procedures for the search, appointment, evaluation, reappointment, and termination of these officers.

3 Annual Evaluation

- a. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the annual review of the President.
- b. Each administrative officer will be evaluated on an annual basis for the purposes of salary review, identification of areas of administrative improvement, and personal development.
- c. The person responsible for making the appointment (~~President or Provost~~) is responsible for coordinating the review. The major constituencies of the position will be asked to contribute information for the evaluation.
- d. In the case of **deans (or dean equivalents) who are appointed to academic units with at least five full-time faculty with tenure/promotion homes in the unit and who provide annual/promotion/tenure evaluations of those faculty,** a committee of Tenure Track faculty, half of whom will be appointed by the faculty senators^[2] from the college or

unit, and half of whom will be appointed by the Provost, will conduct the annual review. At least one of the members of the committee appointed by the faculty senators from the college or unit will serve on the evaluation committee for two years. Each evaluation committee shall have access to previous annual and comprehensive evaluations of the dean being evaluated. Tenure Track, Instructional, and Clinical faculty with **home promotion/tenure departments/schools** in each college or area **will have an opportunity to participate** in the evaluation of their dean by means of a questionnaire that contains both standard questions and questions specifically relevant to the academic unit of the dean. This questionnaire must be anonymous with no tracking of individual responses to different questions (such as "respondent 12 answered X to question 1 and Y to question 2"). As a general rule, different constituencies' responses should be disaggregated by **sub-population (e.g., Tenure-Track and Instructional/ Clinical Faculty responses)**. However, if after the data has been returned, and if the committee determines that the number of Instructional or Clinical Faculty responses is so low as to place any individual at professional risk it can take the extraordinary action of not disaggregating as appropriate. The questionnaire may include space for written comments; however, colleges are encouraged to keep the questionnaire concise. After consultation with the Provost, the committee will issue its final report. It shall be the responsibility of the Provost to discuss the results of the committee's evaluation with the dean.

- e. Should the committee's report to the Provost identify a particularly serious problem, the Provost shall discuss the issue with the dean and report to the committee on the disposition of the matter. If significant concerns continue to be expressed in subsequent annual reviews and there are no clear indications of improvement in the dean's performance, the President or Provost should give serious consideration to terminating the contract of the dean.
- f. All annual faculty evaluation reports of academic **deans (as applicable)** become a part of their permanent personnel records and shall be on file in the office of the Provost and shall be available by application through the Office of Legal Affairs, subject to the same restrictions that apply to faculty files (see [Section 1.D](#)).

4 Comprehensive Review

- a. There will be a more comprehensive review approximately every fifth year to provide a general appraisal of executive performance and accomplishment. The comprehensive review is more explicitly judgmental in nature than the annual evaluation described above. In the case of academic deans, the comprehensive review as outlined below is to provide a basis for determining if a reappointment should be recommended. The next comprehensive review will occur within five years following reappointment and will be completed recently enough that it clearly provides meaningful feedback prior to any reappointment. Evaluations should be completed within the regular academic year.

- b. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the comprehensive review of the President. The Board of Trustees will select a review committee including representatives from the University to assist with the comprehensive review.
- c. For executive officers other than the President, the person responsible for making the appointment (~~President or Provost~~) is responsible for the comprehensive review. For those executive officers other than academic deans ^[2], the review committee will be appointed by the President or Provost who will meet with the committee to discuss the scope, procedures, and goals for carrying out the review. These committees will prepare a report including recommendations that will be considered by the President or Provost prior to any action.
- d. In the case of academic deans, [Heritage College of Medicine \(HCOM\) campus deans](#), [Regional Higher Education campus deans](#), and the [Regional Higher Education Executive Dean](#) the majority of the review committee will consist of faculty from the college or regional campus, with a majority of these faculty members appointed by the faculty senator(s)^[2] from the college or regional campus in consultation with the chair of the Faculty Senate.
 - i. The remainder of the faculty and other members will be appointed by the Provost. [The comprehensive review committee may include faculty \(tenure-track, instructional, and/or clinical\), administrative staff, and students](#). The faculty members serving on the committee will elect the chair from their own number.
 - ii. The Provost ([or Provost designee](#)) will meet with the committee to discuss the general description of the position, the goals and achievements of the college or regional campus, and the general areas of assessment of the dean and general procedures for carrying out the review. The review is to be an intensive one considering the overall performance and accomplishments of the dean.
 - iii. The review committee will gather and assess a full range of information including the dean's self-assessment, pertinent reports including the annual evaluation reports and other data and written general assessments by faculty and appropriate administrators and other constituents. In addition, the committee is encouraged to use personal interviews. The faculty of the college or regional campus should be informed of the comprehensive review of their dean. The faculty serving on the committee will be Tenure Track faculty. The committee will provide an evaluation form to all Tenure Track, Instructional, Clinical Faculty, and any other identifiable constituents deemed appropriate by the committee, which includes an outline of the areas of assessment and the opportunity to provide an anonymous evaluation. After completing the rest of the form, the faculty will be provided the opportunity to add observations and comments including their recommendation on the reappointment of the dean. As a general

rule, different constituencies' responses should be disaggregated (e.g. Instructional, Clinical Faculty, office staff, etc.). However, if after data has been returned, and if the committee determines that the number of Instructional Faculty, Clinical Faculty, or other constituency responders is low enough to place any individual at professional risk, it can take the extraordinary action of not disaggregating data as appropriate.

- iv. The review committee will conclude its analysis by preparation of a report with preliminary recommendations, including a recommendation of non-reappointment or reappointment. The dean will be provided an opportunity to comment on the draft report before a final version is submitted to the Provost. The recommendations of the review committee are to represent their assessment of the full range of information obtained. The evaluation from the faculty of the college or regional campus is to be given critical weight in the development of recommendations by the review committee. In the case where a substantial number (approaching an absolute majority) of the Tenure Track faculty summarize their concerns about the dean's performance by recommending non-appointment, but the committee recommends reappointment, the committee will recommend positive steps to be taken that would lead to the restoration of confidence of the faculty.
- v. The Provost will normally follow the review committee's recommendations, except in extraordinary circumstances and for reasons discussed with the committee, with an opportunity for its response prior to final action.
- vi. Following the comprehensive review, the Provost will distribute a report to the faculty of the college or regional campus. The report will include the Provost's summary of actions taken as a result of the review and the committee's summary of their findings and recommendations.
- vii. The questionnaire used in annual evaluations subsequent to the first comprehensive review will provide the opportunity for faculty to request that a comprehensive review be undertaken the next year. An absolute majority of the Tenure Track faculty may thereby call for the Provost to schedule the comprehensive review for the next year.

Endnotes

[1] Subject to the limitations in Section II.C.4.i.

[2] For those committees whose representatives are chosen by the faculty senators, the chair of Faculty Senate will appoint one senator from each college who is responsible for reporting the nominations in writing to the chair of Faculty Senate. This senator should also contact the nominees to determine their willingness to serve on the committee prior to submitting the

names to the chair of Faculty Senate. Nominations will be sought at a meeting of the senators from each college immediately after the September senate meeting.

Previous endnote [2] was deleted