

# The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

## REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT OF DEANS OF COLLEGES

([Proposal 39-04](#))

([Proposal 13-13](#))

([Proposal 4-17](#))

## Senate Procedures 502.1.1

### 1. Introduction

The Senate developed several shared governance proposals in 1992, one of which was proposal 7-92 for the review and reappointment of deans of colleges. The procedure in proposal 7-92 was used only once for the dean of the college of engineering. Subsequently, at the behest of the university administration, proposal 39-04 was passed that charged each college to develop its own procedure for the review of their dean. No such procedure was developed for the college of engineering (COE), but the college of Science and Arts (CSA) developed a procedure in 1995 that has been used several times, including 2011. This proposal describes a procedure that is an adaptation of one used in CSA. It addresses some of the shortcomings identified by the review committee in 2011. The procedure will be applicable to both COE and CSA.

The review of the dean of CSA in 2011 revealed the following shortcomings.

1. Results of the evaluations were not seen by the constituents of the college who participated in the survey. The review results of department chairs, school deans, and upper administration are made available to the survey participants in some form. Hence, the review of college deans is an exception to the norm of dissemination of review results. The committee also felt that survey participation will fall in subsequent reviews unless the results are shared with the constituents.
2. The provost gives the dean an appointment letter that describes the charge that the dean is expected to meet during her/his four year term. A review procedure that is independent of the charge is less objective and is not fair to the dean, or to the review committee designing the survey instrument, or to the constituents who must respond to a survey and often do not know the dean well.
3. The current CSA procedure pre-supposes that the survey will be conducted using paper copies, while the trend is to conduct survey electronically.

This proposal addresses the above shortcomings in the procedure used for the review of the dean of CSA. The review and reappointment committee will be referred to as the committee in this document.

### 2. Committee Composition

The committee shall be appointed by the provost but shall include a representative from each of the College's departments, a representative from the staff, a representative from the Graduate Student Government, a representative from the Undergraduate Student Government, and a representative from among the College's department chairs. In addition, the committee shall include a representative from the University Senate who shall be from outside the unit whose dean is being evaluated.

The representatives will be elected by the various constituents and the committee will be established in the Fall semester of the review year.

### **3. Informing the Dean**

At least one week prior to calling the first meeting of the committee, the provost will inform the dean to be reviewed that the committee has been formed, give him/her the copy of the review procedure, and the date of the initial meeting of the committee. The provost will ask the dean to write her/his self-evaluation report as per description in 4. Dean Self-Evaluation. The report will be collected by the committee chair in the first week from the date of the committee's initial meeting with the provost.

### **4. Dean Self-Evaluation**

The dean should prepare a written document evaluating his/her performance as dean addressing each of the charges given at appointment and subsequent developments (such as budget changes, institutional goal shifts, etc.)

The self-evaluation should include, but need not be limited to: achievement of unit goals, budget management, growth and quality of programs (teaching, research, and service), management philosophy, growth of endowments and tax-deductible donations, and future needs and directions. The dean is encouraged to provide comparative quantitative data in this report where relevant.

The dean should assemble for the committee recent College-wide documents, such as long-range plans, vision and mission statements, and annual reports.

After receiving these materials, the committee shall decide if additional materials are needed (for example, comparative data from Institutional Analysis) and seek to procure such materials.

### **5. Initial Meeting**

The provost shall call the first meeting of the committee and review its charge, the procedures it should operate under, and the deadlines it should meet. A suggested timetable for the committee's activities is provided as Appendix A. A copy of the charges given to the dean in the letter of appointment will be given to the committee members.

At its first meeting, the committee shall elect its chair, establish (if possible) a convenient meeting time, and establish the following subcommittees:

- Chair Review
- Faculty Review
- Staff Review
- Student Review

Each subcommittee shall consist of at least two members; the chair Review subcommittee shall include the department chair representative; the Faculty Review committee shall be composed of faculty representatives; the Staff Review committee shall include the staff representative; and the Student Review subcommittee shall consist of both student representatives (undergraduate and graduate student groups) and at least one faculty representative.

The duties of the chair Review Faculty Review, Staff Review, and Student Review subcommittees are outlined in 6. Review and Modification of Evaluation Procedures and 7. Chair, Faculty, Staff, and Student Evaluation below.

As soon as possible after the committee's first meeting, the chair of the committee shall meet with the dean seeking reappointment to introduce him or herself and to ensure that the dean's self-evaluation report will be ready by the due date.

### **6. Review and Modification of Evaluation Procedures**

The Chair Review, Faculty Review, and Staff Review subcommittees shall meet to review the procedures and survey questionnaires for their respective constituencies. Copies of questionnaires from

previous reviews will be maintained on the Senate website and will provide preliminary information for the committee. A common standard format will be established by the committee for: the questionnaire; processing of results; and writing of the result summary by each subcommittee.

Each subcommittee shall discuss what adaptations need to be made to the questionnaires to the particulars of their own unit.

Each sub-committee should examine their survey instrument to determine if the constituents can provide additional information or perspective on the charge given to the dean.

The Student Review subcommittee shall prepare recommendations for the committee on the extent of student input and means of securing it.

The students may choose not to conduct a survey but have the dean meet their executive body and provide a written document for inclusion in the final report.

The procedures and survey questionnaires proposed by each of the subcommittees shall be presented to the committee for formal approval.

Input on the survey questionnaires should be solicited from the constituency of each subcommittee. The dean should also be given a chance to comment on the questionnaire and an opportunity to add up to two questions in each questionnaire.

## **7. Chair, Faculty, Staff, and Student Evaluation**

The survey will be conducted electronically and limited to the college constituency represented by the review committee. Logistical support for conducting the survey will be provided by the Senate Administrative Policy Committee (conducts annual electronic survey for review of the central administration) at the request of the committee if needed. All reasonable efforts must be made to ensure anonymity of the survey respondents, and this must be described on the entry page of the survey. The survey must direct each respondent to the appropriate questionnaire developed by the subcommittees.

Links to the following documents should be provided on the entry page to the survey.

1. The relevant portion of the appointment letter describing the charge to the dean.
2. The self-evaluation report by the dean.
3. Any document provided by the dean to the review committee.
4. Any document obtained by the review committee that has a bearing on the survey.

The subcommittees shall be responsible for tabulating and interpreting data from the survey, both quantitative and qualitative, and preparing summaries for the committee as a whole.

Each subcommittee shall present the results of its findings (quantitative data and summaries) to the committee for discussion.

The committee will write a draft report addressing each of the charges given to the dean in the appointment letter but is free to elaborate on any aspect of the review. Comments obtained from the survey will be collated ensuring anonymity of the respondent but will be verbatim. The committee is given limited authority to delete unprofessional language. This limited authority can be exercised only by the consent of the majority of the committee members.

## **8. Interview with the Dean**

The dean will be given the draft report one week prior to scheduling an interview by the committee. After the interview, the dean has one week to submit a written response that will be included in the final report by the committee.

If the provost informs the committee that the dean has decided not to seek reappointment then all review material will be destroyed and the committee disbanded. The provost will inform the college constituents about the dean's decision at the time of dissolution of the committee.

## **9. Recommendation**

After the interview, the committee shall schedule a meeting to reach a recommendation regarding reappointment or non-reappointment of the dean and to finalize the report. The committee shall attempt to reach a consensus on a recommendation without taking a formal vote. If this is not possible and the committee takes a formal vote, that vote shall be reported in the final report.

If there is near consensus on the decision (defined as 3/4 or more voting for a recommendation), the committee shall prepare a single report which summarizes the factors behind its decision.

The report will also contain summaries of questionnaires, statistical report of questionnaires, and the collated verbatim comments from the survey.

If more than 1/4 of the members of the committee disagree with the majority decision, the minority shall be permitted to prepare a minority report, which shall accompany the majority report.

## 10. Dissemination of Final Report

The procedure used for dissemination of the department chair review report that is described in Senate procedure 506.1.1 Section 7 will be used for making the final report of dean review available to the constituents of the college. Faculty members serving on the committee will be responsible for coordinating the dissemination of the report within their department and ensuring that there is no breach of confidentiality during dissemination. Staff and students will be informed of the availability of the report within the constraints of the department procedure. The availability of the report will be for one week, after which all copies made for the purpose of dissemination will be destroyed.

## 11. Conclusion

The committee will write a separate memo to the provost detailing changes and improvements to the procedure. The memo and the final report will be sent to the provost. The committee and the provost will meet for the final time for discussion of the report and the changes to the procedure in the future.

A copy of the memo detailing recommended changes and copies of the questionnaire used will be sent to the Senate President. The copies of the questionnaire will be posted on the Senate website for future use.

The provost will inform the college constituents the outcome of the review process.

## Appendix A: Time Line of Review Process

The senate recommends the following timeline for evaluation. The provost should be sure the committee is appointed no later than the fall semester, so that the evaluation can begin at the start of the spring semester. In the time line below the schedule refers to time when the university is in session.

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| Fall   | The provost starts the selection of the members of the committee in the Fall term of the year of the dean's review for reappointment. See 2. Committee Composition.  |
| Week 1 | The provost informs the dean of the formation of the committee and the date for the first committee meeting and asks the dean to start preparing a self-evaluation report. See Sections 3. Informing the Dean and 4. Dean Self-Evaluation.   |
| Week 2 | The provost calls the first meeting of the committee, defines the charge, and gives all relevant documents. See 5. Initial Meeting.<br>The committee elects chair, establishes subcommittees, and if possible decide on a meeting time.<br>The committee chair meets with the dean.<br>The dean's self-evaluation report is collected by committee chair by end of the week. Copies of the document are sent to all committee members. |

- Week 3 The committee meets to review the procedure and discuss the dean's self-evaluation report and other documents and establish if any other documents are needed. See 6. Review and Modification of Evaluation Procedures
- Week 4 Subcommittees meet to develop questionnaire for the constituencies. See 6. Review and Modification of Evaluation Procedures
- Week 5 The committee meets and discusses the questionnaire developed by the subcommittees. See 6. Review and Modification of Evaluation Procedures.
- Week 6 Input from subcommittee constituency and the dean sought. See 6. Review and Modification of Evaluation Procedures
- Week 7 The committee finalizes plans for conducting of the survey. See 7. Chair, Faculty, Staff, and Student Evaluation
- Week 8 The survey is conducted. See 7. Chair, Faculty, Staff, and Student Evaluation
- Week 9 Subcommittees write summary reports on their questionnaire. See 7. Chair, Faculty, Staff, and Student Evaluation
- Week 10 The committee discusses reports from subcommittees and starts the draft report. See 7. Chair, Faculty, Staff, and Student Evaluation
- Week 11 The committee finalizes the draft report and sends it to dean. See 7. Chair, Faculty, Staff, and Student Evaluation
- Week 12 The committee meets with the dean. See 8. Interview with the Dean
- Week 13 The committee receives the dean's written response. It meets to discuss the recommendation and finalize the report. See 9. Recommendation
- Week 14 The report is disseminated in each department as per Senate Procedure 506.1.1 Section 7. The report is also sent to the provost with a memo for changes in the procedure. See Sections 10. Dissemination of Final Report and 11. Conclusion .
- Week 15 Copies of report used for dissemination in the department are destroyed. The committee has a final meeting with the provost. See 11. Conclusion

## **Appendix B: General Procedures for Sub-committees**

1. Each subcommittee develops procedures and a questionnaire appropriate for enabling its constituency to provide an evaluation of the Dean seeking reappointment.
2. Subcommittee decides on constituency to receive form (Do all faculty, including part-time, receive the evaluation form, or only tenured and tenure-track? Do part-time and/or temporary staff receive the evaluation form?)
3. Each Subcommittee submits its proposed procedures and questionnaire to Committee for approval.
4. Each Subcommittee distributes its questionnaire to its constituency. Anonymity should be preserved.

5. Each Subcommittee as a body reviews the evaluations and prepares a summary for the Committee. Review of comments and preparation of summaries should not be left to a single individual.
6. Each Subcommittee shall shred all printed evaluations at the conclusion of the Committee's work.

## **Appendix C: Chairs Evaluation of Dean**

### **Sample Questions:**

1. Has the Dean clearly expressed a public vision for the College, identified achievable goals leading toward that vision, and defined quantifiable metrics to judge progress towards these goals?
2. Has the Dean provided leadership in pursuing the vision?
3. In general, has the Dean effectively managed the College so that necessary functions (such as budgeting) have been performed efficiently and expeditiously?
4. Does the Dean do a good job in balancing the diverse needs of the wide range of disciplines found in the College?
5. Does the Dean allocate resources to units under him/her in a fair, reasonable, and open manner?
6. Has the Dean been a strong advocate for the College on the university level?
7. Does the Dean convey a positive image of the College?
8. Has the Dean given sufficient attention to recruitment of faculty in under-represented groups?
9. Has the Dean given sufficient attention to increasing diversity among students?
10. Has the Dean successfully built relationships with key external constituents?
11. Does the Dean effectively and accurately communicate the position of the higher administration to the departments?
12. Does the Dean effectively and accurately communicate the position of the departments to the higher administration?
13. Are there any institutional constraints that have limited the Dean's effectiveness? If so, please indicate and explain how they have limited his/her effectiveness?
14. What, in your opinion, have been the Dean's greatest strengths as an administrator?
15. In what areas does this Dean need to improve his/her performance?

## **Appendix D: Faculty Evaluation of Dean**

### **Sample questions:**

Your faculty appointment characteristics:

A= Tenured/Tenure Track

B= Non-tenure track (lecturer, sr. lecturer, principal lecturer, prof of practice)

C=Temporary appointment (instructor)

D=Research faculty

Years of service: A=10 or greater B=5 to 9 C=1-4 D=less than 1

1. The Dean has a coherent vision for the College, which is communicated to the faculty.
2. The Dean is an effective advocate for the College to the higher administration?
3. The actions of the Dean enhance the image of the College inside and outside of the university.
4. The Dean works to create an environment which fosters faculty development.
5. The Dean encourages and rewards effective teaching throughout the College.
6. The Dean encourages and rewards productive research throughout the College.
7. The Dean encourages and rewards service?
8. The Dean encourages open discussion and debate regarding College objectives and goals.
9. The Dean ensures that resources are distributed equitably within the College and that finances are prudently managed.
10. The Dean is able to manage the demands of diverse departments.
11. The College has made steady progress toward the achievement of its academic and research goals.
12. The Dean is an effective in external development and alumni relations.
13. The Dean is both accessible to and accountable to the members of the College faculty.
14. Overall, the Dean has earned the confidence of the College faculty.
15. In what areas does the Dean need to improve? What actions should be taken to pursue these improvements?
16. What are the greatest strengths of this Dean?

## **Appendix E: Staff Evaluation of Dean**

### **Sample Questions:**

Please answer Yes or No to the following. Provide details and examples if appropriate:

1. The Dean has a coherent vision for the College.
2. The Dean has communicated the goals of the College.
3. The Dean allows opportunities for discussion and input into goals, ideas, decisions, etc.
4. The Dean instills high college morale.
5. The Dean fosters a spirit of cooperation and teamwork.
6. The Dean maintains an environment free of discrimination and harassment.
7. The Dean projects a positive image of the unit throughout the university community through his/her actions.
8. The Dean is accessible to the members of the College staff.

9. Overall, the Dean has the confidence of the College staff?
10. What are the strengths of the Dean?
11. How can the Dean improve his/her performance?
12. Additional comment:

Proposal 39-04:

Adopted by Senate: 21 April 2004

Approved by President: 27 April 2004

Proposal 13-13:

Introduced to Senate: 27 March 2013

Approved by Senate: 10 April 2013

Approved by Administration: 19 April 2013

Proposal 4-17:

Introduced to Senate: 19 October 2016

Senate Approved to Split Proposal 4-17 in two: 02 November 2016

Senate Amended Proposal (in blue): 16 November 2016

Senate Approved Proposal: 18 January 2017

Administration Approved Proposal: 30 January 2017