

## Executive Summary

In the spring of 2019 representatives of the Ohio Faculty Council (OFC) were surveyed about evaluations of academic administrators<sup>1</sup> (the specific questions posed can be found at the end of this summary).

Of the fourteen OFC institutions, twelve responded. Two OFC institutions (Youngstown State and Shawnee State) currently have no such evaluations. OFC members from ten institutions (University of Akron, Bowling Green State University, Central State University, University of Cincinnati, Cleveland State University, Kent State University, Ohio State University, Ohio University, University of Toledo, and Wright State University) replied to a set of five questions about their university's policies and practices.

1. *How does your faculty evaluate or provide feedback on your institution's administrative personnel (deans and provosts)?* The answers to this question varied widely. Faculty members at all of the universities periodically evaluate deans, but some do not evaluate provosts. Some perform annual reviews while others perform reviews once every four or five years. Some reviews are done in an in-depth and very thorough manner by committees while others are based only upon surveys that use Likert scales. One university has a Faculty Senate standing committee named the Committee for the Evaluation of Central Administrators that each year conducts a year-long, in-depth review of two central administrators and their entire offices. Most such reviews are authorized by collective bargaining agreements, faculty personnel policies, or the academic Senate.

2. *How often are such evaluations conducted or feedback generated?* The most frequent practice is once per every four or five years. One university conducts their evaluations annually, and a couple of others conduct theirs in relation to the term of the dean's appointment.

3. *How are data shared with administrative personnel, faculty, and/or other stakeholders?* The most frequent practice is to share the results of the evaluation with the provost and the administrator getting reviewed. In the case of deans, several universities share a report about the results with the faculty members of the relevant college.

4. *How has the feedback generated by such evaluations been used at your institution?* Responses included (a) reappointment decisions, (b) establishing goals, (c) commenting on progress toward those goals in subsequent reports, (d) administrative office or job duty restructuring, and (e) salary. A couple of the respondents doubted whether their universities used the information at all.

5. Can you share the instrument(s) your institution uses to conduct such evaluations or generate feedback on administrative personnel? Two universities had forms to share. Others either used college-specific forms too numerous to share or used confidential forms.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this study, academic administrators were defined as academic deans and provosts.

Summaries of institution-specific answers to the above questions about academic administrator evaluations are as follows:

## Question 1: Faculty Role in Administrative Evaluations

***How does your faculty evaluate or provide feedback on your institution's administrative personnel (deans and provosts)?***

### **University of Akron**

Faculty participation in review of academic deans is included in the CBA (Article 10, Section 3). No such provision is made for provosts. A review committee is convened by the Provost or an associate provost and the committee is comprised of a dean from another college, staff in the college, faculty bargaining unit members in that college, and at least one department chair or director. Dean completes a self-study and submits that to the committee and is also made available to the college faculty. Faculty provide anonymous, written, qualitative evaluations of the dean. The committee reviews results from the evaluations and forwards a recommendation to the provost who makes a determination as to whether or not to renew the dean's contract.

### **Bowling Green State University**

Faculty evaluate academic deans annually and conduct a cumulative reappointment review in the last year of a dean's term. A majority of committee members on the evaluation committee come from the dean's college and they are charged with collecting data from faculty in the dean's college and the dean is invited to submit a report to the faculty of her or his activities and accomplishments in the evaluation period. The committee also solicits anonymous feedback from the faculty in the dean's college. The committee prepares a summary report for the faculty and submits a reports to the Provost and the dean under review. The Provost acknowledges the committee's report and incorporates the report into the dean's evaluation.

### **Central State University**

Faculty complete anonymous assessments of administrators, summaries of which are provided to the administrators under review and kept in the institution's Office of Academic Planning and Assessment.

### **University of Cincinnati**

Early in the fall term of the penultimate year of each dean's appointment, if the dean does wish to serve another term, the dean shall be reviewed by a committee of faculty of that college charged to report to the provost on the quality of leadership provided by their dean in accomplishing the goals and objectives for the college. The provost will provide the committee with copies of the annual reports that the dean has prepared for the faculty during the dean's tenure. The faculty assessment committee must function in a confidential manner during its deliberations to the extent permitted by law. When the faculty assessment committee has gathered its data and completed its internal deliberations, it shall meet with the provost to present its findings, to respond to questions by the provost, and to ask questions of the provost. Following this dialogue, the committee will submit a summary report to the provost, including a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment of the dean. Should the provost's decision be to recommend reappointment of the dean, the provost and the dean will review and update, as appropriate, the goals and objectives for that particular college. The dean will then issue a report to the faculty, as done after each of the annual assessments, including in that report the length of the reappointment."

The committee typically also includes students and a staff member appointed by the Provost. The provost can also appoint additional members representing the community, alumni, and others, and for diversity. Faculty are selected to the committee according to the bylaws of the college. All faculty are sent an anonymous survey conducted by the university's Institute for Policy Research which is considered independent. The provost's office also solicits letters for evaluation.

### **Cleveland State University**

CSU's procedures for dean and department chair evaluations are described in its Faculty Personnel Policy <https://www.csuohio.edu/sites/default/files/3344-11-07%20-%202015%20changes%20.pdf>.

There is no written policy/procedures for evaluation of Provost. Dean evaluation forms are prepared by the Provost's office which provides "for written comments and an overall evaluation of the dean's service as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory." The provost conveys to the dean a summary of the responses.

### **Kent State University**

An evaluation is required of all academic administrators (provosts, deans for various schools and regional campuses, and deans of graduate and undergraduate studies, deans of the university libraries). A review committee is established which is comprised of different constituencies. For the Provost, this include a member of the faculty senate executive committee, four senior faculty members, two associate provosts or deans, and one department chair or school director. Section 6-05.3.E of the policy includes information about the composition of review committees for regional campuses, independent schools, undergraduate studies dean, graduate studies dean, library deans, and honors college dean. The provost notifies the faculty senate committee on administrative officers of any reviews scheduled within the next twelve months at the start of the academic year. The administrator scheduling the review notifies the faculty members of the administrator's unit. It is the review committee's responsibility to "ensure as wide as possible a base of input to the review." The committee may invite "written statements from faculty, staff, students, and alumni" and interview relevant constituents and stakeholders. The committee issues a written report to the administrator who scheduled the review. The report contains a narrative of the committee's process and the data it collected. The administrator who scheduled the review evaluates the report and shares a copy of it along with the scheduling administrator's commentary to the administrator under review. The review committee is also charged with "recommending any desirable change in the procedures to the committee on administrative officers." The administrator under review comments on the report and that commentary is also provided to the faculty in the unit.

### **Ohio State University**

The University Senate has a standing committee named the Committee for the Evaluation of Central Administrators (EOCA). The committee of eight faculty, two of whom are deans, conducts a year-long, in-depth process to evaluate two central administrators. The committee divides into two panels, each of which add some additional members including students and staff. Each panel interviews in person 10-15 campus leaders, including other administrators, faculty, staff and students, who interact with, or are impacted by, the administrator being evaluated. In addition to the person, the panel also evaluates the organization, effectiveness, and impact of the office and team that is led by the administrator.

For the reappointment of deans, a small committee of faculty and administrators is convened, a survey of all college faculty and staff is conducted, interviews of college and campus leaders is done, and a report is drafted for the provost.

### Ohio University

Currently at Ohio University, faculty within each college/regional campus evaluate annually their academic dean. As per the Faculty Handbook (January 2019):

...A committee of [tenure track] faculty, half of whom will be appointed by the faculty senators from the college or unit, and half of whom will be appointed by the Provost, will conduct the annual review. At least one of the members of the committee appointed by the faculty senators from the college or unit will serve on the evaluation committee for two years. Each evaluation committee shall have access to previous annual and comprehensive evaluations of the dean being evaluated. [Tenure track and Instructional] faculty in each college or area will participate in the evaluation of their dean by means of a questionnaire that contains both standard questions and questions specifically relevant to the academic unit of the dean. This questionnaire must be anonymous with no tracking of individual responses to different questions...As a general rule, different constituencies' responses should be disaggregated. However, if after the data has been returned, and if the committee determines that the number of...responses is so low as to place any individual at professional risk it can take the extraordinary action of not disaggregating as appropriate. The questionnaire may include space for written comments; however, colleges are encouraged to keep the questionnaire concise. After consultation with the Provost, the committee will issue its final report. It shall be the responsibility of the Provost to discuss the results of the committee's evaluation with the dean. (Section VIII.E.3.d, p. 111)

Annual evaluation reports become a part of the academic dean's permanent personnel records and remain on file in the office of the Provost. Deans are not required to share the results of the evaluation report with faculty within their college/regional campus, but some do so.

Faculty also participate in a comprehensive evaluation of their academic dean within five years following reappointment so as to provide meaningful feedback prior to any subsequent reappointment. This committee make up and evaluation process is similar to the annual review process. However, as part of the comprehensive evaluation, the review committee will

gather and assess a full range of information including the dean's self-assessment, pertinent reports including the annual evaluation reports and other data, and written general assessments by faculty and appropriate administrators and other constituents. In addition, the committee is encouraged to use personal interviews. (Ohio University Faculty Handbook (Jan. 2019), Section VIII.E.4.d.iii, p. 113)

As part of the comprehensive evaluation, the faculty are also asked to provide their recommendation on the reappointment of the dean. Administrative staff within the college/regional campus also participate in this evaluation process. The evaluation committee prepares and presents at a meeting a draft report to the Provost, at which time feedback is provided for faculty to consider before submitting the final

report. The Provost will later distribute a report, which includes their own summary of actions taken as a result of the review and the committee's summary of their findings and recommendations, to the faculty of the college.

### **University of Toledo**

Biennial evaluation is sent electronically to all faculty members of a college (or all faculty for the Provost) and completed online after verification. Verification is decoupled from the response to ensure each faculty member only evaluates once, but that their identity is not tied to their evaluation. The instrument has both Likert-scale type of responses and open ended comments.

### **Wright State University**

Deans and provosts are reviewed annually (using an informal annual feedback mechanism) as well as a more formal fifth year review. Informal review is sought via email and, just this year, collected in some cases via on campus-wide survey instrument.

For the fifth year review, a committee is formed (chaired by a Dean), with targeted questions agreed upon by the committee members. Committees consist of a dean (named by the Provost), a department chair from the college (appointed by the Provost), faculty members (including 1 faculty member selected by the dean being reviewed). The expected timeline for reviews lasts the full academic year.

## Follow-Up: Authority or Document Describing Evaluation

***Are such evaluations or feedback mechanisms described in a Board policy or procedure, a faculty governance bylaw, or some other document?***

### University of Akron

Faculty participation in review of academic deans is included in the CBA (Article 10, Section 3).

### Bowling Green State University

The collective bargaining agreement (CBA) negotiated between the BGSU Faculty Association and university administration requires regular faculty evaluation of Deans and the Provost. Article 10, Section 3 covers evaluation of Deans, while Article 10, Section 2.3 covers evaluation of the Provost.

The CBA is available here:

<https://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/provost/documents/policies-guidelines/cba3-20190701.pdf>

### Central State University

In the CBA (Article 20, section 20.4).

### University of Cincinnati

BOT ORC 3361:50-3-02, Section E

### Cleveland State University

CSU's procedures for dean and department chair evaluations are described in its Faculty Personnel Policy <https://www.csuohio.edu/sites/default/files/3344-11-07%20-%202015%20changes%20.pdf>. There is no written policy/procedures for evaluation of Provost.

### Kent State University

Board policy: <https://www.kent.edu/policyreg/administrative-review-academic-administrative-officers>

### Ohio State University

A Faculty Senate Committee oversees the process. The below language comes from the Senate's website:

#### Membership

The committee for evaluation of central administrators shall consist of eight members.

1. Six tenured faculty members appointed in the spring by the president from a slate nominated by the executive committee of faculty council.
  - a. The term of service is three years. Members shall not be reappointed to a second term until they have been off the committee for at least two years, except that a member may be reappointed immediately if that person was appointed to fill a vacant position with a remaining term of less than two years.
  - b. A chair will be elected each spring from among the faculty members serving on the committee.
2. Two administrators, appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the president. The term of service is three years.

#### Duties and Responsibilities

1. During spring semester, the executive committee of faculty council, on behalf of the steering committee, shall meet with the president and provost to identify two central administrators for review. All senior central administrators, such as vice provosts and members of the president's council, are eligible to be reviewed.
2. The review panels shall be responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the central administrator and the office in carrying out the responsibilities of the office. The review will begin no later than the start of autumn semester of the following academic year, and finish no later than the end of December.
3. The review panel will, after its review and evaluation, present a written report to the president and provost. The review panel will also send a copy of the written report to the person being reviewed and will inform the steering committee that the review process has been completed.
4. The chair of the committee shall monitor the activities of the review panels and advise the review panels on matters of procedure.

### Organization of Review Panels

In the spring preceding the academic year in which the review is to be conducted, the committee shall organize itself into two review panels, each review panel to be organized as follows:

1. Three faculty members from the committee, one of whom is designated by the president or provost, in consultation with the committee chair, as chair of the review panel.
2. One administrator from the committee.
3. One student member appointed by the provost if a vice provost or senior vice provost is under review or by the president if a vice president or senior vice president is being reviewed.
4. One staff member appointed by the provost if a vice provost or senior vice provost is under review or by the president if a vice president or senior vice president is being reviewed.
5. One to three additional faculty members, if needed, nominated by the committee chair and appointed by the president or provost after consultation with the committee.

### Ohio University

Language regarding faculty involvement of academic deans are included in the Faculty Handbook.

### University of Toledo

The 'authority' for this evaluation is given in the Faculty Senate Constitution Article II.7 Responsibilities & Jurisdiction "To facilitate bi-annual formative assessments of the provost, vice provost(s), and deans to ensure accountability and improve administrative performance."

(<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/constitution.html#articleII>)

### Wright State University

At Wright State University, the review of administrators is prescribed by university policy (with executive responsibility shared by the Provost and the Faculty Senate). <https://policy.wright.edu/policy/2060-review-administrators>

The feedback mechanisms are also included as part of our Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), prescribing both the informal review of chairs and deans and the formal fifth year review (Articles 10.5.1. and 10.5.2).

## Question 2: Frequency of Evaluations

### ***How often are such evaluations conducted or feedback generated?***

#### **University of Akron**

Every four years.

#### **Bowling Green State University**

Evaluation of the Provost is required to be “periodic,” while evaluation of Deans is “annual.”

#### **Central State University**

Every three years.

#### **University of Cincinnati**

Depends upon term of dean’s appointment (3-7 years?). The review is conducted in the penultimate year of the appointment if the Dean wishes to seek an another term.

#### **Cleveland State University**

Dean evaluations are conducted every four years. Chair evaluations follow a similar schedule.

#### **Kent State University**

Every four years unless an administrator wishes to require a review to occur earlier.

#### **Ohio State University**

The EOCA committee conducts two reviews every year. Most of the data collection occurs in the autumn semester and a report is generated in the spring semester.

#### **Ohio University**

Faculty participate in annual evaluation questionnaires of their academic dean as well as comprehensive evaluations of their academic dean which includes recommendations for reappointment.

Comprehensive evaluations are conducted every five years.

#### **University of Toledo**

Every other year.

#### **Wright State University**

Informal review: annually (via email). Formal review: every 5 years.

## Question 3: Sharing of Evaluation Data

### ***How is data shared with administrative personnel, faculty, and/or other stakeholders?***

#### **University of Akron**

The dean's self-study is made available to the faculty at large in the fall semester. The results of the Provost's decision is reported to the review committee but also "to the bargaining unit, contract professionals and staff in the college and shall include the Provost's recommendation for the dean."

#### **Bowling Green State University**

For review of Deans, the CBA requires that the review be completed by a committee, as well as the following, "The committee shall transmit their report in writing to the Provost and to the Dean and share a summary of the report with the BUFMs of the college. After each annual evaluation and cumulative reappointment review, the Provost shall confirm that the BUFMs' report was reviewed and incorporated as appropriate into the Provost's evaluation of the Dean."

Regarding evaluation of the Provost, the language is vague. This is it in its totality, "There shall be a formal advising role for BUFMs in the selection of the Provost, and in the periodic evaluation of the Provost."

#### **Central State University**

It is unclear if the data is shared with faculty or other stakeholders. Summaries of the faculty assessments are shared with the administrator under review and maintained by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment.

#### **University of Cincinnati**

The Faculty Review Committee submits a summary of their findings to the provost, including a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment. If the Dean is recommended for reappointment by the committee and the Provost, the Dean issues a report to the faculty in the same fashion as the annual assessments.

#### **Cleveland State University**

Typically, a summary of evaluations (not raw data) and decision on whether the dean/chair is reappointed are shared with faculty and other stakeholders in the unit.

#### **Kent State University**

Faculty in the unit led by the administrator under review receive a report from the administrator who scheduled the review, and they also receive commentary from the administrator under review regarding the report from the review committee.

#### **Ohio State University**

Each EOCA panel writes up its report with conclusions, and presents it to the President and the Provost, as well as to the person being evaluated. The details of the report are not shared widely with the campus community, but the committee chair does write up an annual report which is posted on the senate website.

#### **Ohio University**

Deans are not required to share annual evaluation reports, which are kept in the dean's personnel file and maintained in the Provost's office. During comprehensive evaluations (which are conducted every

five years), an evaluation committee comprised of faculty submits a draft report to faculty for review before submission to the Provost. The Provost then prepares a report of her or his “actions taken as a result of the review and the committee’s summary of their findings and recommendations” and distributes that report to the faculty of the college.

#### **University of Toledo**

Previously it was shared via e-mail to the college faculty of the dean being evaluated. This year it will be shared via secure link to a password protected shared folder. The evaluation is also shared with the person being evaluated and the Provost (for Deans) or President (for Provost).

#### **Wright State University**

For the formal review, the committee prepares a summary of results from the survey and shares this summary, along with all returned questionnaires, to the Provost. The Provost then uses this information to prepare a report for all faculty in the administrator’s unit. As prescribed by the CBA, chairs and deans will not be given the informal feedback pertaining to themselves until after the faculty members in their unit have received their annual evaluations.

## Question 4: Use of Evaluation Feedback

### ***How has the feedback generated by such evaluations been used at your institution?***

#### **University of Akron**

The feedback is shared with a review committee which issues a recommendation to the provost.

#### **Bowling Green State University**

The CBA codifies and protects processes that were mostly in place before BGSU faculty unionized. The CBA requires that, "the Provost shall confirm that the BUFMs' report was reviewed and incorporated as appropriate into the Provost's evaluation of the Dean." I believe faculty assessment of these administrators has been used in reappointment decisions, but no written proof of that is available.

#### **Central State University**

Feedback is shared with administrator under review.

#### **University of Cincinnati**

The feedback is shared with the administrator under review in order to make a renewal/non-renewal decision.

#### **Cleveland State University**

The feedback is used to determine whether to reappoint a dean/chair. If the dean/chair is reappointed, it is also used to help the dean/chair improve his/her performance by addressing the concerns reflected in the feedback.

#### **Kent State University**

Feedback from OFC representative: not sure how the data are used. According to the policy, the administrator under review establishes goals based on the feedback and comments on progress toward those goals in subsequent annual reports.

#### **Ohio State University**

The feedback generated by the evaluations has been used by the President and the Provost in various ways that are generally consistent with the conclusions drawn by the EOCA panel. Although not necessarily because of the evaluations, some observations about what has followed for the individuals/offices involved include contract extensions or reappointments, administrative office or job duty restructuring, and resignations or non-reappointments.

#### **Ohio University**

Feedback generated by annual and/or comprehensive evaluations has been used to inform decisions made by upper administration (Provost, President) regarding salary, reappointment, and reassignment/termination.

#### **University of Toledo**

It has been used in the Deans' annual review, and to communicate the faculty sentiment (both good and bad) toward their leadership.

#### **Wright State University**

Many faculty and staff members read the final reports but we are unaware of any significant action taken or changes made as a result of the administrative evaluations.

## Question 5: Examples

***Can you share the instrument(s) your institution uses to conduct such evaluations or generate feedback on administrative personnel?***

**University of Akron**

No instrument shared.

**Bowling Green State University**

Each college uses a different survey, and they are not available in a public medium.

**Central State University**

No instrument shared.

**University of Cincinnati**

No instrument shared.

**Cleveland State University**

See appendix A

**Kent State University**

No one form or instrument used. Nothing to share.

**Ohio State University**

The EOCA process is available online. Although it is followed consistently, the process for the reappointment of deans is not published.

**Ohio University**

No instrument shared.

**University of Toledo**

We're in the process of updating the form, and I don't have a copy that reflects the current version, so I don't think I can share.

**Wright State University**

See appendix B

Appendix A: Cleveland State University Decanal Evaluation Form

## Appendix B: Wright State University Sample Feedback Request

(From the Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs)

TO: All Full-time Faculty

FROM: xxx Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs

In accordance with the university's policy on "Faculty Participation in the Review of Administrators," I am inviting you to send to Provost xxx any feedback you wish to provide regarding the Dean of your college, the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the Chief Information Officer, the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, and/or the University Librarian. You may send your comments anonymously through this qualtrics link [xxx](#).

We will accept feedback through the first week of Fall Semester 2019.

Should you have any questions about this memo or the policy on which it is based, please do not hesitate to contact me xxx

Thank you”

### **Sample Informal Feedback request (generated via email from the Dean):**

“Colleagues,

I am writing to invite you to provide feedback about the performance of your department chair, and the Provost will solicit feedback from Bargaining Unit Faculty about the performance of their dean. Chairs and deans will not be given the informal feedback pertaining to them until after the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in their unit have received their annual evaluations pursuant to Section 11.2.” As you know, the policy applies equally to Instructors, Lecturers, and others outside the bargaining unit.

The review policy is available at: <https://policy.wright.edu/policy/2060-review-administrators> and is also described in Section 10.5.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement under "Informal Reviews of Chairs and Deans.”

If you wish to submit feedback, please do so by xxx. Please let me know if you have questions.”

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND SELECTION<sup>2</sup>**

#### Committees to review Deans of Degree-Granting Colleges with Department Chairs

- 1 dean named by the Provost
- 1 department chair from inside the college elected by the chairs of the college
- 3 faculty members (2 tenured faculty members and 1 lecturer, instructor, or untenured Assistant Professor) selected by this representative body of the college faculty (senate,

---

<sup>2</sup> From “Implementation Guidelines for Faculty Participation in the Review of Deans, Directors, and the University Librarian.” Revised, April 2005.

steering committee, etc.). For SOM and SOPP, the 3 faculty members will include 2 faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and 1 faculty member at the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor.\*

- 1 faculty member selected by the Executive Committee of the university faculty Senate \*
- 1 faculty member selected by the dean being reviewed\*

#### Committee to review Dean of Nursing and Health

- 1 dean named by the Provost
- 2 faculty members (1 tenured and one clinical faculty member) selected by the CoNH Faculty Organization
- 1 faculty member selected by the Executive Committee of the university faculty Senate \*
- 1 faculty member selected by the dean being reviewed

### **QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED**

The following questions will be given to the committees with instructions to accept or modify these questions. The final list of questions, to be approved by the Provost, should generally include no more than 8 broad questions.

#### Standard Questions for Deans of Colleges with Faculty Appointments

Please comment on the Dean's effectiveness in any or all of the following six areas. Be as specific as you can, providing examples where possible to support your conclusions.

1. Faculty Relations
2. Program Development
3. Leadership
4. Decision Making
5. Resource Management
6. Overall Performance as Dean