

From: APAFT Committee

To: Executive Committee

Date: Mar 9, 2011

Re: Report on Charge 7 of the APAFT Committee

Charge 7: Review PPM 1-17, Selection and Evaluation of Academic Deans, and make recommendations.

Discussion: The appointment portion of PPM 1-17 (parts II, III, IV and VI) needs clarification in some areas and expansion in other areas. The evaluation portion of PPM 1-17 (parts V and VII) of the document is not specific enough and has a number of inconsistencies. There should also be clear differentiation between procedures for initial appointment, interim evaluations, and reappointment reviews. The purpose of the faculty advisory committee is unclear.

Comments on the Appointment Portion (parts II, III, IV and VI):

1. The last segment in part II, “the dean may be reappointed after evaluation as outlined below” can be interpreted that the reappointment may occur regardless of the result of the evaluation.
2. In part III, there is no policy for a college made of combination of departments and programs*. Also, the document does not distinguish between a program within a department or a stand alone program.
3. In part III, the screening committee should include some of the department chairs and program directors and staff from the college; ideally, the student representative should be the student senator from that college.
4. What is meant by an “authorized program” in part III.B1?

Comments on Evaluation Portion (parts V and VII):

1. In part V.A., define/describe “pertinent constituencies”.
2. In part V.B., additional questions should be approved by the entire college (50% passing?) or the advisory committee. See recommendation 4(e) in APAFT’s charge 6 report.
3. In part V. C., does it simply imply evaluation every other year? Who can request evaluation in other years?
4. In part V.C., no differentiation is made between review for reappointment and an interim review.
5. The parts V.D. and E, it is not clear that the advisory committee interprets data, produces a report, or both.

* This committee cannot find a definition of program in the PPM.

6. In part V.D. it is stated “Deans may have access to annual evaluations as desired” What *annual* evaluations? See comment 3 above.
7. There is no stated implication for a poor review by the faculty/staff or any other group. For example, to be chosen or reappointed as a chair, one must have support of at least 50% of the department. See recommendation 4 in APAFT’s charge 5 report.
8. In part VII, since the associate or assistant dean may have specific responsibilities, the dean survey form may not be appropriate for their review and if they oversee certain portion of faculty and staff, then the survey of those faculty and staff should have a higher weight.
9. In Part V.A it is stated that there should be a formal survey of all faculty and staff, yet in the rest of Part VI it is referred to only as the Faculty Survey Instrument. And if the survey is given to both faculty and staff, shouldn’t staff have a role in generating the instrument (Part V.B). See the next comment.
10. If staff members are involved in responding to the survey, shouldn’t they be represented on the advisory committee? It should be noted that Library has more staff than faculty and Continuing Education has only staff. Therefore, the review process of the University Librarian and the dean of Continuing Education should be done differently than other deans.
11. The current practice of the survey being sent out directly from the Provost’s Office is in conflict with the survey to be handed out by the department secretary as stated in Part V.C.
12. The nature of the report mentioned in Part V.E needs to be clarified. Should it say “advisory committee report” instead of “faculty committee report” or, should the Advisory Committee to be called the Review Committee?
13. The “Review Committee” may be expanded to include staff or a department chair while limiting the voting members to a smaller group, like the Ranking Tenure Committee members.

Recommendations: The committee recommends PPM 1-17 be updated. The provost should work closely with those developing the survey and clarify its use and purpose in evaluating deans. See item 1 in discussion of APAFT’s charge 6 report. PPM 1-17 should include clear delineation between the initial appointment, interim two-year review, and evaluation for reappointment. A minimum approval rating in the Faculty Survey should be established for first and subsequent reappointments, for example 50% and 60%. See recommendation 4 in APAFT’s charge 5 report. Consequences of the interim review and reappointment evaluation must be made clear, for example, in salary increases, terms of reappointment, etc. The “Advisory Committee” should now be designated as the “Review Committee” and produce a report on its recommendation based on a vote of the committee. See recommendation 1 in APAFT’s charge 5 report. Below are some minor recommendations in addition to the above general recommendations.

1. Include a definition of “academic program” in Section II Appointment.
2. Section III A-1 should add “and/or independent program” to have representation along with the departments.

3. Section III A-1 & 2 should include some department chairs or directors of independent programs and staff to serve on the Screening Committee, not necessarily as voting members.
4. It would be useful to separate out the survey results of different constituencies (staff, faculty, chairs, etc.) without compromising the anonymity and the integrity of the process.
5. The composition of the Advisory Committee needs to be reconsidered, and voting eligibility for members (staff, faculty, department chairs, within the college, outside the college) need to be established.