

Review Procedures for IUPUI Administrators

I. Introduction

Under the leadership of the Chancellor, senior campus administrative officers and school deans, in conjunction with the faculty, are responsible for advancing the objectives and mission of the IUPUI campus. The Chancellor has specific responsibility for ensuring that the incumbents of these offices perform effectively. Consequently, the Chancellor will arrange for the periodic evaluation of administrative officers holding positions that bear directly on the campus-wide teaching and research mission of IUPUI and of deans with multiple campus responsibilities who report to the Chancellor in the latter's capacity as Executive Vice President of Indiana University. Their performance, and the performance of their offices, will be evaluated regularly by a review process.

The review applies to (1) those officers reporting directly to the Chancellor or the Executive Vice Chancellor of the IUPUI campus, specifically including Vice Chancellors, the deans of schools, the dean of the IUPUI University Library, and the directors of support units organized as responsibility centers; (2) the associate deans who administer the IUPUI branch of core schools whose dean reports to the IUB Provost—core school deans are to be reviewed through procedures developed at the University level and approved by the University Faculty Council; (3) those officers reporting directly to Vice Chancellors (including Associate Vice Chancellors, Assistant Vice Chancellors, and some Directors) who oversee critical services that impact research, teaching, or service. Such officers may be reviewed at the same time as the officer they report to when advisable.

In addition, the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council may also recommend to the Chancellor that other campus administrative officers be reviewed, including officers who report to the IU administration but whose responsibilities are principally confined to IUPUI's teaching or research mission.

The purpose of these reviews is to assist the Chancellor and other senior administrative officers in meeting the responsibilities of their respective offices and in advancing the mission of the campus (or campuses) by identifying opportunities for greater effectiveness in a collegial fashion. The processes of the academic community must be characterized by reasoned discourse, intellectual honesty, mutual respect, and openness to constructive change. An important aspect of administrative leadership is the candid exchange of views between administrators and their constituents. Although such discussion should occur continuously, periodic reviews offer a special opportunity to evaluate accomplishments and to renew commitments. The review process has thus been established to promote the greater effectiveness of administrative officers by ensuring that they understand and reflect the highest goals and aspirations of the academic community. Reviews are conducted in the expectation that incumbents will become more effective in their roles as a result of constructive evaluation.

The review will be conducted at an initial time to be selected by the Chancellor but not later than early in the fifth year in office and in recurring intervals of at least every five years thereafter. Every possible effort should be made to synchronize administrative reviews with program reviews and periodic reviews by accrediting agencies. School and Library deans and most senior campus administrators serve without fixed terms at the discretion of the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the Chancellor and President. Periodic reviews afford the Chancellor an opportunity to ensure that these administrators and their offices remain effective. The review of administrators within schools (e.g., assistant deans, department chairs, center directors) should

be conducted in accord with each school's own internal procedures; the same may apply to associate deans, but, depending on the scope and impact of their responsibilities, they may be included in the review of the office of the dean they serve at the discretion of the unit's faculty governance leaders. The review of administrators (chiefs of staff, directors, assistant vice chancellors, and the like) within the Chancellor's or a Vice Chancellor's administration whose function does not immediately impact the research, teaching, or service mission of the campus should be conducted internally in accord with the Administration's own procedures. This does not preclude their participation or inclusion in a review of the office of the senior administrative officer to whom they report.

II. Committee Selection

Review committees will be appointed by the Chancellor according to the following provisions.

- A. A majority of the members of the review committee will consist of tenure-track and, where appropriate, non-tenure-track faculty. The committee will normally consist of no less than five nor more than eleven members. Review committee size should be kept to a minimum consistent with representing all necessary constituencies. Ordinarily, a dean of comparable rank will be appointed to committees reviewing School deans.
- B. In reviews of academic administrative officers of a particular school, a majority of members of the review committee will be chosen from a list of tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty from that school recommended by an appropriate elected faculty body of the school; the list should contain roughly one-third more names than requested by the Chancellor and should not include officers who are part of the reviewed officer's administration. In reviews of the Dean of the IUPUI University Library, a majority of members of the review committee will be chosen from a list of librarians recommended by an appropriate elected librarian body of University Library, and who are not themselves administrative officers; the list should contain roughly one-third more names than requested by the Chancellor. In reviewing administrative officers other than school and library deans, the faculty members will be identified by the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee as noted below. The deans of schools with programs offered on other campuses in addition to IUPUI will be reviewed in accord with the procedures outlined below, except that faculty from other campuses will be included on the review committee in approximate proportion to the degree they comprise the faculty of the school. The elected school body should make its recommendations in accord with this principle.
- C. The IUPUI Faculty Council's Executive Committee will submit a list of prospective review committee members for the balance of the faculty or librarian committee membership in the case of school or library deans and for the full faculty committee membership in the case of campus administrative officers; other members may be appointed as noted below. The list should contain roughly one-third more names than requested by the Chancellor.
- D. In addition to receiving nominations for the review committee from the IUPUI Faculty Council, the Chancellor may solicit nominations from representative student and staff bodies as well as other constituencies, as appropriate, including representatives from other campuses when the deans of core or system schools are being reviewed.
- E. The Chancellor will appoint the review committee chair, ordinarily from among the faculty or librarians. With rare exceptions, the chair of the review committee should be a senior, tenured faculty member or librarian who is a current extra-mural peer administrator.

F. The Chancellor may appoint external consultants with the advice of the review committee to prepare reports which would assist members in their work and provide a national perspective on the unit under review.

G. Before being finalized, the composition of the review committee shall be examined by the administrator under review, who may object to any nominee for cause. The Chancellor shall give appropriate weight to these objections in forming the review committee.

H. Review committees will normally be established early in the fall semester and each review process will normally be completed early in the succeeding spring semester, or before. Most reviews should take only a matter of weeks or a few months to complete, but each review committee will be assured of enough time to complete its work in a manner consistent with its charge.

I. Each spring the Chancellor will confer with the Faculty Council Executive Committee about the administrators to be reviewed during the next academic year; a tentative list of officers to be reviewed will be announced by the Chancellor at the last meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council in the spring.

J. The Chancellor and President of the Faculty Council will confer with their counterparts on the Bloomington or other campuses as necessary to ensure that review committees of system school deans with multicampus responsibilities are constituted and charged in a manner consistent with the respective deans' responsibilities.

III. Committee Charge

Although reviews are conducted to assist the Chancellor in evaluating the effectiveness of senior administrators, faculty (pursuant to the IUPUI Faculty Constitution, Article II.A.) and other constituents have an interest in both the review process and the results. To ensure that the broad interests of the faculty are adequately and routinely addressed, the Chancellor will confer with the President of the IUPUI Faculty Council about reviews. Specifically, the Chancellor and the President of the IUPUI Faculty Council will convene the committees for reviews; in the case of deans of system schools, the president or secretary of other relevant campus faculty councils may be asked to participate if the Chancellor deems that circumstances warrant it, consistent with existing university guidelines or procedures.

The Chancellor will provide the review committee with a description of the duties and responsibilities of the administrator under review and reports of previous reviews. Individuals to be reviewed will provide a statement of their own goals and objectives. The Chancellor will assure that the administrator under review meets reasonable requests by the review committee for information as well as arrange for reasonable and adequate staff and financial support for the activities of the review committee. The review committee will establish its own procedures, provided that it responds with data to the following questions as a minimum:

A. Has the administrator exercised appropriate leadership of the unit in establishing, maintaining, and facilitating clear goals and objectives?

B. Has the administrator provided evidence of the achievement of the unit's goals and objectives?

C. How effectively does the administrator represent the unit to persons outside the unit, including peers nationally?

- D. How successful has the administrator been in managing the human and financial resources of the unit in the face of competing pressures or uncertainty?
- E. How is the unit perceived by its faculty and staff? How is the unit perceived on campus, system, state, and national levels?
- F. How is the administrator perceived by the unit faculty and staff as well as by relevant constituencies?
- G. How effectively has the administrator led the unit in carrying out unit and campus policies, including affirmative action plans and the unit's five-year plan?
- H. What are the administrator's strengths and weaknesses and their impact upon effectiveness?
- I. How successful has the administrator been in responding to suggestions for change and improvement expressed in the previous review if there has been one?

All tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty or librarians (or employees of a service unit) should be given an opportunity to comment on the administrator's effectiveness by responding to a survey that includes the above questions (among others developed by the committee) and by providing additional narrative comments. Other University officials with whom the administrator interacts routinely should also be asked to comment, particularly in the case of system school deans or core school associate deans, or of administrators whose campus and University responsibilities are closely intertwined. Administrators being reviewed must be given access to survey results and to other materials considered by the review committee along with an opportunity to respond or to comment before the committee prepares its report.

Review committees will not consider anonymous submissions and will develop procedures ensuring that all relevant constituencies be given an opportunity to convey their comments, whether solicited or unsolicited, in a manner that protects their absolute confidentiality. Surveys should be administered in accord with customary practices designed to ensure the integrity of the process and to protect the identity of respondents by removing the names of respondents before survey results are released to the administrator under review, the Chancellor, or others.

IV. The Report

Prior to submitting a final report to the Chancellor, the review committee should meet separately with the official being reviewed and then with the Chancellor to discuss the findings of the report. The administrator under review should be given an opportunity to respond to the committee's findings before the committee meets with the Chancellor. The review committee then should make its report in writing to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will respond in writing to the review committee, noting any actions to be taken as a result of the committee's findings and recommendations. The Chancellor will provide the official reviewed with a copy of both the review committee's report and of the Chancellor's response. The review committee's report should consist of a narrative and critique, a representation of survey response rates, a summary of the committee's findings, any external consultant's reports, and recommendations. In the case of campus administration officers, the Chancellor will meet with the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee in executive session to discuss the report. In the case of school deans and core school associate deans, the Chancellor will provide a summary report to the faculty of the school. In the case of the Dean of the IUPUI

University Library, the Chancellor will provide a summary report to the librarians. The IUPUI Faculty Council will post a copy of the summary report on its website.

NOTE: The language of the introduction and of paragraph II.I. has been designed to mandate the periodic review of certain campus administrative officers while permitting flexibility in including other campus officers as circumstances warrant. The following list is *indicative* of officers who would be eligible for review under the procedures proposed for adoption. The Chancellor and core school Deans are already covered by University Procedures and thus are not included. Administrative positions subject to periodical review under this policy are defined primarily by the extent of their responsibilities and the significance of their impact on the campus's research, teaching, and service missions, not by the terminology or hierarchical level reflected in their titles. Individual titles that are listed may be combined for the purpose of a review at the discretion of the Chancellor and the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee.

Executive Vice Chancellor/Dean of the Faculties

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Associate Dean of the Faculties

Assistant Dean of the Faculties

Associate Vice Chancellor for Lifelong Learning

Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Academic Planning and Evaluation

Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration

Vice Chancellor for Research

Vice Chancellor for Student Life/Dean of Students, including Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Life and Learning, Assistant Dean of Students

Assistant Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Vice Chancellor for External Affairs

Associate Vice Chancellor/Executive Director, Enrollment Services

Deans of campus and system schools reporting to the Chancellor or to the Executive Vice Chancellor (including Associate Deans as appropriate)

IUPU-Columbus's Vice Chancellor and Dean

Associate Deans of the IUPUI branch of core schools whose Dean reports to the IUB Provost

Dean of the IUPUI University Library (including Associate Deans as appropriate)

IUPUI Associate Vice Chancellor for International Affairs/IU Associate Vice President for International Affairs

Director, Office of Equal Opportunity

Director, Graduate Office/Associate Dean, IU Graduate School

Athletic Director

Revised 6/13/94; 01/20/2010

Approved by IFC, 2/2/2010

Review Procedures for Core School Deans

Rationale

Review provides a formal, systematic mechanism for faculty to have input into assessment of administrators. Well-designed reviews at regular intervals also provide opportunities for input and feedback for the improvement of administration, provide opportunities to acknowledge successful administration, and

IUPUI Supplement to the Indiana University *Academic Handbook*

Approved May 4, 2010; Updated Yearly and Archived on July 1, 2012

encourage both the administration generally and the individual administrator to set appropriate goals for the unit in question and to assess the administrator's success in reaching those goals.

Review extends beyond the review of the individual administrator because, in general, it stimulates internal review of the units for which the administrator is responsible, and it allows those most directly affected (i.e., the faculty, students, and staff) to study the administrator's responsibilities.

Formally detailing separate review procedures for Deans of Core Schools is desirable due to the inevitable complexities of administration in these multi-campus programs.

Procedures

1. Core School Deans who report to the Provost, Bloomington, shall have their performance and that of their offices evaluated on a regular basis. As of the effective date of this policy, those Deans include:
 - A. Dean of the School of Education
 - B. Dean of the School of Informatics and Computing
 - C. Dean of the School of Journalism
 - D. Dean of the Kelley School of Business
 - E. Dean of the School of Library and Information Science
2. Core School Deans who report to the Chancellor, IUPUI, shall have their performance and that of their offices evaluated on a regular basis. As of the effective date of this policy, those Deans include:
 - A. Dean of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs
 - B. Dean of the School of Nursing
3. For each of these Deans, a comprehensive review (hereafter referred to as review) shall be conducted early in the fifth year in office and at recurring intervals of four years or more frequently if desired by the Provost/Chancellor. In addition, independent of these comprehensive reviews, each Dean shall be evaluated by a survey distributed to the faculty of the Dean's unit at the beginning of the Dean's third year in office (see section 11). The Provost or Chancellor will provide reasonable and adequate staff and financial support for these review activities.
4. In the spring semester of each academic year, the Provost and/or Chancellor shall provide the University Faculty Council with a list of all Core School Deans subject to review the following year. The Provost/Chancellor shall request the creation of Review Committees simultaneously with the announcement of the Deans to be reviewed in order to allow at least one semester for completion of the Review process. Review committees will normally be established early in the fall semester and each review process will normally be completed early in the succeeding spring semester, or before. Each review committee will be assured of enough time to complete its work in a manner consistent with its charge.

The Provost/Chancellor shall have responsibility for selecting the members of the Review Committees according to the following procedures:

- A. The Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Faculty Council and the Nomination Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council shall seek names from the Advisory Committee, Policy Committee, or similar faculty-elected committee (whichever is appropriate) of the unit being reviewed, and from other relevant groups, to be considered for inclusion in the list to be provided by the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee. The majority of the members of each Review Committee shall be full-time faculty from the unit whose Dean is being reviewed. Relevant members of the community may be nominated for membership on the review committee.

- B. The University Faculty Council Agenda Committee shall submit a list of prospective Review Committee members to the Provost/Chancellor. The UFC Agenda Committee's list shall contain approximately one-third more names than the number of committee members anticipated by the Chancellor/Provost to be on the Review Committee, so as to provide him or her with some choice in the selection of members for the committee. Only those individuals nominated by the UFC Agenda committee shall be appointed to the Review Committee.
 - C. The number of faculty selected from each campus in the Core School shall roughly mirror the proportion of faculty from each such campus.
 - D. In addition to receiving nominations for the Review Committee from the University Faculty Council, the Provost/Chancellor shall solicit nominations from appropriate representative student and staff bodies as well as other constituencies, as appropriate, on both campuses.
 - E. The Dean under review shall not provide any nominations for the Review Committee.
 - F. Before being finalized, the composition of the Review Committee shall be reviewed by the Dean, who may object to any nominee for cause. The Provost/Chancellor shall give appropriate weight to these objections in forming the Review Committee.
 - G. The Provost/Chancellor shall select a senior faculty member, preferably a current or former Dean, to chair the Review Committee.
5. The Provost/Chancellor and the co-Secretaries of the UFC shall convene the Review Committee. The Provost/Chancellor shall provide the Review Committee with a description of the duties and responsibilities of the Dean under Review, and the Dean to be reviewed will provide a statement of her or his own goals and objectives. The Review Committee shall respond with data to the following questions as a minimum:
- A. How has the Dean exercised leadership of the unit, including working with appropriate constituencies to establish, maintain, and facilitate clear goals and objectives?
 - B. To what extent does the Dean facilitate the achievement of these goals and objectives?
 - C. How effectively does the Dean represent and promote the school to constituencies outside the university, including state stakeholders, national peers, and international groups?
 - D. How well has the Dean managed resources to maintain the integrity of the unit when faced with outside pressures?
 - E. How is the unit perceived by its faculty and staff? How is the unit perceived on each campus of the Core School and throughout the university system?
 - F. How effectively has the Dean led the unit in carrying out unit and campus policies on both campuses, including implementing affirmative action plans and aligning the campuses' and school's strategic plans?
 - G. How effectively has the Dean worked with and implemented policies adopted by relevant faculty governance bodies?
 - H. What are the Dean's strengths and weaknesses and their impact upon his or her effectiveness?
6. Review of Core Campus Deans is both important and complex. Therefore, it is important for Review Committees to consider the following guidelines:
- A. Opportunities for involvement should be provided to all stakeholder groups, including students, who can reasonably be assumed to have valuable input on the Dean's effectiveness. This involvement should include opportunities to suggest questions in addition to those listed in Section 5 that may be important within the context of the Dean's specific unit.
 - B. Although surveys, as described in Section 11, are an important part of the review process, they should not be the only method through which data are collected. Interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and examination of extant data, among other methods, could all be used to gather information on the

Dean's effectiveness. Ideally, most findings – and all critical findings – should be checked using multiple methods.

- C. Multiple members of the committee, from both campuses, should be involved in the analysis of data to ensure that one person's perspective does not dominate the summary and recommendations in the final report.
7. The report should consist of a description of processes, a narrative and critique, a summary of the committee's findings, supporting documentation, and recommendations. To ensure that the particular interests of each campus are represented, the report narrative should include a separate section summarizing the results for each relevant campus in addition to a general summary that cuts across all campuses for which a Dean is responsible.
8. Once a draft of the Committee's report is available, the Review Committee shall observe the following procedures:
 - A. The Committee shall provide the reviewed Dean with a copy of the draft report.
 - B. The Committee chair and a committee member of full faculty rank chosen by the Committee shall meet (not less than three days later) with the Dean being reviewed to discuss the draft report. The Dean should be given an opportunity to respond, in writing, to the committee's findings before the committee meets with the Provost/Chancellor.
 - C. The Committee shall consider the Dean's feedback, if any is offered, and prepare the final report.
 - D. The Review Committee then shall meet with the Provost or Chancellor to submit and discuss its final report, including the Dean's written response to the final report, if one is provided.
 - E. The Provost/Chancellor shall meet with the Dean to discuss the final report.
9. Copies of the reports of the Reviews of the Deans listed in 1.A-F and 2.A-B above shall be conveyed to the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council, the Agenda Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council, the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Faculty Council, and to the Dean's elected Policy Committee or corresponding elected governing body. A final report may be made public at the discretion of the Dean reviewed.
10. The Provost/Chancellor, in consultation with the UFC Agenda Committee and Review Committee chair, shall determine what elements of the final report and the Provost/Chancellor's response should be included in a public summary document. That document must include an accurate characterization of the results of any data collection activities conducted by the Review Committee, although stakeholders' verbatim quotes should not be included. The summary report should be distributed to all faculty and staff in the applicable core school.
11. Surveys shall be conducted as follows:
 - A. A survey shall be conducted at the beginning of a Dean's third year in office. Thereafter, a survey shall be conducted as part of each comprehensive review.
 - B. The Provost/Chancellor shall appoint an independent agent (such as the IUB Center for Survey Research or the IUPUI Survey Research Center) to design and conduct the survey.
 - C. The survey shall be in three parts:
 1. A set of approximately 10 questions, the same for all Deans, drafted by the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee in consultation with the survey agent and approved by the University Faculty Council. These questions will address such issues as the Dean's leadership, administrative skills, encouragement of faculty, and program development.
 2. A set of approximately 5 unit-specific questions prepared by the Review Committee in the case of a survey conducted in connection with a comprehensive Review, or by the Dean's elected Policy Committee or corresponding elected governing body, in the case of a survey conducted at the beginning of the Dean's third year in office.

3. Sufficient space for written comments.
- D. The survey agent shall send a copy of the survey to each faculty member of the Dean's unit and collect all faculty responses within a specified period of time. The agent shall make a tabulation of the responses to the questions and a compilation of the written comments, without reference to the originator. Surveys should be administered in accord with customary practices designed to ensure the integrity of the process and to protect the identity of respondents by removing the names of respondents before survey results are released to the Dean under review, the Provost/Chancellor, or others.
- E. A copy of the written comments shall be conveyed to the Dean and to the Provost/Chancellor and shall be treated as confidential. The tabulated results of the remainder of the survey shall be conveyed to the Chancellor/Provost, to the Dean, and to the Dean's elected Policy Committee or corresponding elected governing body. In the case of a survey conducted in connection with a comprehensive Review, the results also shall be made available to the Review Committee. The tabulated results shall be treated as confidential unless confidentiality is waived by the Dean.
- F. In the case of a survey conducted in connection with a comprehensive Review, the tabulated results of the survey shall be reflected in the draft and final reports as stipulated in Section 8 above. In the case of an initial survey of a Dean, the Provost/Chancellor shall prepare a summary report of the tabulated survey results, in conformity with the procedures of consultation stipulated in Section 9 above.

Approved by UFC, 3/23/2010

Program Review

In Fall 1993, academic deans, the Planning Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council, and the faculty-led Program Review and Assessment Committee developed guidelines for academic program review. Prior to this time, several individual academic units had been reviewed by discipline-specific accrediting bodies or Graduate School, but the campus had not conducted its own comprehensive reviews. The first academic review conducted under the new guidelines took place during 1993. The first academic support unit was reviewed in 1994.

Academic program review is a collaborative process designed to bring to bear the judgment of respected colleagues in assessing and improving the quality of academic and service units. This process involves students, faculty, community members, school and campus administrators, and external specialists in the discipline in (1) gathering information about a program (i.e., a department, or a school if the school has no departments), (2) reviewing and analyzing this information during a site visit, (3) synthesizing all available information and making judgments about overall program quality and recommendations for improvements, and (4) following up to ensure that the unit is fully supported in its efforts to address the outcomes of the reviews.

While self-study and peer review are also fundamental components of the external process of accreditation, program review at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) serves important internal purposes. In its statement of mission and goals this campus has committed itself to continuous improvement of its programs and services, to setting new standards for collaboration and interdisciplinary work, and to strengthening community connections that promote academic and cultural activities as well as economic and