

To: UFC
From: Alex Tanford, Chair of Policy Review Committee
Date: April 25, 2023
Re: Review of senior administrators and their offices

A. Overview

1. Three policies address the review of senior administrators and their offices.
ACA-10, Review Procedures for Administrators
ACA-11, Review Procedures for Core School Deans
ACA-13, Review Procedures for Chancellors and Provost
2. This motion presents a major revision to ACA-10 and minor updates to ACA-11. A full review of ACA-11 and ACA-13 will begin next year.

B. The UFC Policy Review Committee and the Vice-President for Human Resources have jointly reviewed ACA-10 on the review of senior administrators and their offices, and find:

1. A thorough review and revision is appropriate because the university has a new president who has restructured the senior administrative offices and indicated she will review them all on a rotating 5-year basis of 2-3 reviews per year.
2. The Constitution of the IU Faculty is ambiguous. Section 2.2 gives faculty legislative authority over the review of “academic officers.” Section 2.3 gives faculty consultative authority over the review of “administrative offices affecting the academic mission.” It does not define the two categories. The best solution is a collaborative process in which the UFC and the administration jointly develop review procedures meaningful to both.
3. Current ACA-10 is unclear which offices headed by vice-presidents are to be reviewed with faculty input. Every such office has an impact on academics, so a single review process that always involves faculty is appropriate for all.
4. ACA-10 should be replaced with a new policy designated “UA” because it covers administration offices with university-wide responsibilities.

C. Review process

The revised policy was developed in cooperation with University HR, reviewed by the Policy Review Committee, and has been circulated to campus faculty councils for comment.

D. The Committee moves that the UFC take the following actions:

1. Rescind ACA-10.
2. Approve the attached UA policy on Review of University Offices.
3. Approve the attached amendments to ACA-11.

Review of University Administrative Offices UA-xx (to be determined by the Office of Policy Administration)

About This Policy:

Effective Date: 4/25/2023

Last Updated: 4/25/2023

Responsible University Administrator: President, Indiana University

Responsible University Offices: Office of Human Resources, University Faculty Council

Policy Contacts: IU Human Resources, askHR@iu.edu; University Faculty Council.

ufcoff@iu.edu

Scope

These procedures apply to reviews conducted on the following University Administration (UA) offices that report to the University President:

- Capital Planning and Facilities
- Communications and Marketing
- Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
- Finance and Administration
- General Counsel
- Human Resources
- International Affairs
- Research
- Student Success
- University Information Technology
- University Relations

Policy Statement

A. The review of University Administration offices is the responsibility of the President.

B. University Administration offices should be reviewed once every five years with 2-3 reviews completed each year. Each review should be completed within a three-month time frame and should be conducted during the academic year to maximize participation from faculty and students.

C. The review should cover:

1. The structure and operation of the office,
2. The scope of responsibilities assigned to it,
3. The adequacy of its resources. and
4. The performance and leadership of the senior administrators in the office.

D. The review process should be transparent and include an executive summary of the review results that is made public to the IU community. However, all participants in a review are expected to maintain confidentiality while the review is underway.

E. Reviews shall include a structure to assure open communication among the participants about the process and the results. These reviews are designed to be collaborative and ultimately provide support and guidance to the President and the office, and the result should be meaningful data regarding the effectiveness of the office, which may inform its future operating procedures and practices.

Reason For Policy

Regular reviews of University Administration offices provide a mechanism to measure the successes and the opportunities for growth within the highest levels of Indiana University. The focus on offices, rather than just reviewing their leaders, allows a more comprehensive look at the services provided and whether the office is meeting the needs of the IU community.

Procedures

A. The Review Committee

1. Reviews shall be conducted by a Review Committee appointed by the University President. The Review Committee chair will be from an outside firm with expertise in such reviews selected by the University President. The Committee shall be composed of 7-10 members appointed by the University President in consultation with the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Council and appropriate governance groups representing other affected constituencies such as staff and students.
2. Faculty membership should be weighted relative to the extent to which the office affects the academic mission of the university. As such, committees reviewing International Affairs, Research, and Student Success, should have substantial faculty membership.
 - a. All committees must have at least one faculty member.
 - b. Faculty members shall be selected from a list supplied by the UFC Executive Committee, which shall strive for diversity among appointment classifications and perspectives in compiling the list.
3. One member of the committee should be an outside expert in that functional area. A member of Internal Audit should serve as an ex-officio member of the committee whose primary role will be to guide the committee chair on the internal processes of the university.

B. Components of a Review

1. Self-report: Prior to convening a review committee, the administrator of the office under review shall complete a concise self-report that addresses key areas such as strategic vision, success metrics, policies and procedures, diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives, fiscal responsibility and compliance with relevant University policies and state and federal laws.

2. Surveys: An anonymous survey on multiple dimensions of the office, including but not limited to the areas identified in Section C of the Policy Statement, will be given to the primary stakeholders affected by the actions of the office, as determined by the Review Committee. The survey questions should be consistent across all reviews and focus on the experience of stakeholders including the quality of service offered, the ease of interacting with the office, and the trust constituents have in it. It shall include questions about specific components, offices and programs within the office being reviewed. The Review Committee may use the services of the IU Center for Survey Research.
3. Targeted Focus Groups: The Review Committee will host targeted, structured, small, focus groups with members of the office's primary constituents. Other IU offices that the office partners closely with should be included in these discussions. The Committee should ensure input from all campuses and may solicit individual feedback as appropriate.
4. Committee Assessment: The Review Committee will complete an assessment of the operations of the office in the areas identified in the self-report and in Section C of the Policy Statement. The Committee will work with various offices across the University to collect the necessary data for this assessment.

C. Final Report

1. The committee will submit to the University President a final report summarizing the findings of the survey, focus groups and committee assessment. The report should highlight key strengths and successes, areas for improvement, and any recommendations for future initiatives for the office. A copy of the report should be sent to IU Human Resources for archiving and to retain a historical record of these reviews.
2. A succinct executive summary of the report composed only of high-level observations and recommendations should be developed and shared with key stakeholders and the university community.

History

This policy is the result of a collaborative effort between the UFC and IU Human Resources. It was approved by the Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer and the UFC on April 25, 2023.

Portions of this policy replace ACA-10, Review Procedures for Administrators. Future revisions should involve both the University Faculty Council and IU Human Resources.

Review Procedures for Core School Deans ACA-11

About this policy

Effective Date: 03-23-2010

Date of Last Review/Update: ~~03-23-2010~~ 04-25-2023

Responsible University Office: University Faculty Council

Responsible University Administrator: University Faculty Council

Policy Contact: ufcoff@iu.edu

Scope

A. As of the effective date, this policy applies to the following Deans who report to the Bloomington campus Provost:

~~a. Dean of the School of Education~~

1. ~~b.~~ Dean of the **Luddy** School of Informatics, and Computing and Engineering

~~c. Dean of the School of Journalism~~

2. ~~d.~~ Dean of the Kelley School of Business

~~e. Dean of the School of Library and Information Science~~

3. ~~f.~~ Dean of the **O'Neill** School of Public and Environmental Affairs

B. As of the effective date, this policy applies to the following Deans who report to the IUPUI campus Chancellor:

1. Dean of the School of Nursing

2. **Dean of the School of Social Work**

Policy Statement

A. Core School Deans who report to the Bloomington campus Provost, shall have their performance and that of their offices evaluated on a regular basis.

B. Core School Deans who report to the IUPUI campus Chancellor, shall have their performance and that of their offices evaluated on a regular basis.

Reason for Policy

A. 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 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.

B. 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.

C. 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

A. 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 **five** ~~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 **K 9**). The Provost or Chancellor will provide reasonable and adequate staff and financial support for these review activities.

B. 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.

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

1. 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 **Executive 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 **university** community may be nominated for membership on the review committee.
2. The UFC **Executive Agenda** Committee shall submit a list of prospective Review Committee members to the Provost/Chancellor. The UFC **Executive 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 **Executive Agenda** committee shall be appointed to the Review Committee **as faculty representatives**.

3. The number of faculty selected from each campus in the Core School shall roughly mirror the proportion of faculty from each such campus.
4. 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.
5. The Dean under review shall not provide any nominations for the Review Committee.
6. 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.

D. The Provost/Chancellor shall select a senior faculty member, preferably a current or former Dean, to chair the Review Committee.

E. The Provost/Chancellor and the **co-chairs** ~~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:

1. How has the Dean exercised leadership of the unit, including working with appropriate constituencies to establish, maintain, and facilitate clear goals and objectives?
2. To what extent does the Dean facilitate the achievement of these goals and objectives?
3. How effectively does the Dean represent and promote the school to constituencies outside the university, including state stakeholders, national peers, and international groups?
4. How well has the Dean managed resources to maintain the integrity of the unit when faced with outside pressures?
5. 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?
6. How effectively has the Dean led the unit in carrying out unit and campus policies on both campuses, including **implementing policy UA-01, Non-Discrimination/Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action** ~~affirmative action plans~~ and aligning the campuses' and school's strategic plans?
7. How effectively has the Dean worked with and implemented policies adopted by relevant faculty governance bodies?

8. What are the Dean's strengths and weaknesses and their impact upon his or her effectiveness?

F. Review of Core Campus Deans is both important and complex. Therefore, it is important for Review Committees to consider the following guidelines:

1. 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 E 5 that may be important within the context of the Dean's specific unit.
2. Although surveys, as described in Section K 9, 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.
3. 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.

G. 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.

H. Once a draft of the Committee's report is available, the Review Committee shall observe the following procedures:

1. The Committee shall provide the reviewed Dean with a copy of the draft report.
2. 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.
3. The Committee shall consider the Dean's feedback, if any is offered, and prepare the final report.
4. 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.

5. The Provost/Chancellor shall meet with the Dean to discuss the final report.

I. Copies of the reports of the Reviews of the Deans listed in the Scope above shall be conveyed to the ~~Executive Agenda Committees~~ of the University Faculty Council, the ~~Agenda Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council~~, and 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.

J. The Provost/Chancellor, in consultation with the UFC ~~Executive 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.

K. Surveys shall be conducted as follows:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. The survey shall be in three parts:
 - a. A set of approximately 10 questions, the same for all Deans, drafted by the University Faculty Council ~~Executive 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.
 - b. 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.
 - c. Sufficient space for written comments.
4. 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.

L. 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.

M. 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 ~~K 9~~ above.

History

University Faculty Council March 23, 2010.

Minor amendments by UFC to reflect changes in the names and structures of affected units, April 25, 2023.