

PERIODIC REVIEW OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

January, 2024

Academic deans, vice provosts, and the dean of libraries will be reviewed according to the following procedures during every fifth year of service.

PURPOSE

These reviews have the following objectives:

1. To develop a meaningful basis for the decision to continue the appointment of the dean or central administrator (vice provosts and dean of libraries);
2. To enhance administrative performance of the dean or central administrator;
3. To increase professional development for the dean or central administrator; and,
4. To improve accountability of the dean or central administrator to appropriate constituencies.

Periodic reviews of collegiate deans or central administrators shall occur every five years without regard to the timing of the review of the college or term of appointment. *Ad hoc* reviews of deans or central administrators may be conducted outside the five-year cycle according to the provisions below.

SELF-ASSESSMENT

The collegiate dean or central administrator shall be responsible for preparing a self-assessment of their performance during the period under review. The self-assessment shall take into account recommendations of prior reviews and the goals and mission of the most recent strategic plan, if any, of the University, college or office. The self-study should describe:

- The area's mission and broad goals, including its relation to the university as a whole and with comment on any recent or planned changes;
- The area's programs, especially significant changes made during the review period;
- The area's organizational and governance structure;
- The role of the administrator as seen by them;
- Accomplishments and the administrator's role in them; and
- The outlook for the future, including aspirations for the area and obstacles confronting it.

REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

For each periodic and *ad hoc* review, a review committee (hereinafter the "committee") shall be organized to compile information and make recommendations to aid in the overall assessment of the administrator.

The final composition of a review committee will be determined by the Provost and Executive Vice President. However, at a minimum, each administrator's review committee shall include:

1. The chair of the committee appointed by the Provost and Executive Vice President.
2. One faculty member from outside, and two faculty members from inside, the college.
3. One staff member from the college.

For the deans of the Graduate School, Honors College, and Libraries, and vice provosts the review committee will include at least 3 faculty members and one staff member. The chair of the committee will be appointed by the Provost and Executive Vice President. The final composition of a review committee will be determined by the Provost and Executive Vice President.

For the purposes of this subsection, the definition of "faculty members" is equivalent to the definition of faculty members who may vote in collegiate elections of representatives to the Faculty Senate.

The Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President provides administrative support to prepare an assessment tool (e.g., Qualtrics survey) for the review.

The review committee may request additional information that it thinks necessary to prepare an assessment of the administrator's performance. The Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President will facilitate the request for additional information from respective offices throughout the WSU system.

SCOPE

The committee shall evaluate the administrator's performance within each of the following areas, taking into account the degree to which each area relates to the administrator's responsibilities. The committee should consult with the Provost and Executive Vice President (or designee) in identifying those aspects of the following areas that are most pertinent to assessing the administrator's performance:

1. Goal formation and attainment. Has the administrator taken a leadership role in formulating appropriate goals for the office or unit, reflecting awareness of educational and professional trends, and consulted with the faculty of the office/unit in the process of doing so? If goals were agreed upon at the beginning of the period under review, to what degree have those goals been attained?
2. Scholarship. Does the administrator encourage scholarship among the faculty and create an environment that fosters and encourages scholarly pursuits? Do they recognize excellence in scholarship?
3. Educational leadership. How well does the office/unit fulfill its educational mission? How effective is the administrator in stimulating discussion of new ideas about teaching and in encouraging and guiding promising developments through to implementation? Has the administrator helped to provide an environment within the office/unit and between the office/unit and other parts of the University that enhances the educational efforts of faculty and students? Does the administrator establish a congenial educational environment?
4. Personnel management. Does the administrator show concern for and zeal in recruiting or encouraging the recruiting of the highest quality new appointments available? How well does the administrator do in choosing, evaluating, and supervising subordinates reporting directly to them? How well does the administrator's office perform in general?
5. Resource management. Does the administrator seek to obtain resources including fundraising and development that are adequate to enable the office/unit to achieve its full academic potential, and arrange for appropriate support services for the office/unit?
6. Relationships among constituencies. Does the administrator establish and enhance good working relationships with faculty, staff, students, external constituencies, and

- those other administrators with whom the administrator regularly interacts? Does the administrator work well with the multi-campus system?
7. Planning and policy making. Does the administrator: 1) involve the faculty, including those at the regional campuses, and other relevant constituencies in planning and policy-making; 2) provide opportunities for consultation through individual and group meetings; and 3) provide information (except for information to which access is restricted by other policies) in a timely, full, and open manner to facilitate effective participation in planning and policy-making?
 8. Equity, diversity, and belonging. Does the administrator provide effective leadership in the implementation of University policies relating to human rights and demonstrate a commitment to equity, diversity, and belonging?
 9. Promoting constructive innovation. Does the administrator encourage constructive suggestions for new goals or programs, or new ways for accomplishing ongoing goals more effectively?
 10. Responsiveness. Does the administrator provide effective responses to inquiries and problems? Is the administrator open to reasonable suggestions and feedback?
 11. Scope of leadership. Has the administrator demonstrated knowledge of developments and educational leadership beyond their office/unit, including campus-wide leadership and leadership at the state or national level, as appropriate to their responsibilities?

PROCEDURES

1. The Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President provides administrative support to prepare an assessment tool (e.g., Qualtrics survey) for the review to obtain information and evaluations from relevant faculty, staff, and students with regard to the performance areas identified above. In all cases, it is important to obtain feedback from appropriate categories of subordinates of the administrator under review, as well as from supervisors and peers (e.g., other deans, vice provosts, chancellors). System-wide feedback is required.
2. Review of Central Academic Officers. The review committee evaluating a central academic officer will be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the self-assessment and survey data regarding the performance of the officer and the office under review. The committee will meet as often as necessary to review, discuss, and summarize in writing the results of this evaluation process, and to prepare any recommendations they deem appropriate.
3. Review of Deans. In partial fulfillment of their duties under the first paragraph, committees reviewing deans shall collect, through a questionnaire, anonymous faculty, staff, and student evaluations of the administrator. The questions will be informed by the categories of administrative performance listed above to the extent that they are relevant. The questions will conform to the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) below.
 - a. Respondents will be instructed to select their responses for a single category/number on the following scale:

No Chance to Observe / 1 Strongly Disagree / 2 Disagree / 3 Agree / 4 Strongly Agree. A question may also provide an opportunity for a qualitative narrative response.

- b. At a minimum, the faculty questionnaire shall ask respondents to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with the following five statements (the "core questions"):
- i. The dean has my trust and respect.
[No Chance to Observe 1 / 2 / 3 / 4]
 - ii. The dean helps meet its teaching mission of the unit.
[No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4]
 - iii. The dean promotes an environment of high expectations for the quality and quantity of scholarship.
[No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4]
 - iv. The dean is responsive to faculty inquiries, problems, feedback, and suggestions.
[No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4]
 - v. Overall, the dean is effective.
[No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4]
 - vi. The dean should be re-appointed for another term.
[Yes / No]

For most reviews, additional survey questions or an open-ended invitation to provide additional comments will prove beneficial in evaluating the dean.

REPORT

1. Preparation. The committee is responsible for assembling the information obtained from faculty, staff, and students; formulating conclusions; and making a recommendation concerning the retention of the administrator. It shall compile a confidential report containing this information. The committee's report will normally be completed within one semester.
2. Communicating Review Outcomes to Administrator. Upon completing its report, the committee shall transmit the report to the Provost and Executive Vice President who shall summarize the substance of the report, its recommendations, and the strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation. The summary may also include the Provost and Executive Vice President's suggestions for addressing specific issues and concerns, as well as any requirements for reappointment. The Provost and Vice President shall share the summary with the administrator within 45 business days of receiving the Committee's report.
3. Informing faculty, staff, and students in the case of reviews of deans. The Provost and Executive Vice President shall share a summary with the constituent faculty, staff, and students within 60 business days of receiving the committee's report, but not in the summer.

If the Provost and Executive Vice President decides not to reappoint the administrator, or the administrator elects not to seek reappointment, it will be solely within the Provost and Executive Vice President's discretion what is reported to the faculty, staff, and students.

4. Informing Relevant Constituencies in the Case of Reviews of Central Academic Officers. The Provost and Executive Vice President will determine the distribution of the summary of the final report in the case of the review of central administrators.

PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT'S ASSESSMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATOR'S PERFORMANCE

1. An additional step is required in the review of every administrator who is eligible for and willing to provide continued administrative service. This final step shall be an explicit written affirmation by the Provost and Executive Vice President that continued service by the administrator would be in the best interests of the University. Such an affirmation may be unconditional or may be conditioned on changes in subsequent performance or on the receipt of a positive assessment of the administrator under a future *ad hoc* review. The Provost and Executive Vice President will determine the guidelines for the handling of instances in which no affirmation is possible, or in which some significant improvement in performance is necessary, even if the performance of the administrator under review is not so weak as to warrant a change in leadership.

AD HOC REVIEWS

1. *Ad hoc* reviews shall occur when ordered by the Provost and Executive Vice President: 1) on their own motion; 2) upon the request of the administrator; or 3) upon the request of the faculty pursuant to paragraph 2 below.
2. The faculty, as defined above may request an *ad hoc* review of an academic dean, a vice provost, or the dean of the libraries by petitioning the Provost and Executive Vice President. If 50 percent or more of the faculty petition the Provost and Executive Vice President, the Provost shall order an *ad hoc* review. If 25 percent to 50 percent of the faculty petition the Provost and Executive Vice President, the Provost shall meet with the petitioning faculty and discuss the request. Thereafter, the Provost and Executive Vice President shall decide whether to order an *ad hoc* review.
3. *Ad hoc* reviews will be conducted in the same manner as periodic reviews subject to modifications jointly agreed upon by the Provost and Executive Vice President and the committee pursuant to the paragraph below.

PROCEDURAL VARIATIONS

The Provost and Executive Vice President may consider and approve, for good cause shown, departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, if they and the review committee agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of the review.