



University Senate
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee

**Reconciling RBHS procedures for Review of Deans and Programs
with Other Existing Procedures**

A. Charge

S-1701: Consider and make recommendations as to how procedures for review of deans and programs at RBHS might best be reconciled with existing procedures in other parts of Rutgers. Respond to the Senate Executive Committee by October 2018.

B. Background and Summary

In this charge, the FPAC considered where specific processes concerning periodic evaluation of deans, chancellors, or other programs at units that comprise RBHS might be analogous and thus reconciled with those already in place at legacy Rutgers.

Legacy Rutgers has current policy (adopted by the senate in 2009) for periodic review of deans in Rutgers-Camden, Rutgers-Newark, and Rutgers-New Brunswick¹ (refer to section C1), and policy for periodic review of the chancellors, revised in 2018² (which includes the RBHS chancellor). RBHS, however, does not have a current policy in place for periodic review of deans. They do have published guidelines (School/Institute Review Template³) for formal review of “each school, institute, and academic department within a school to be conducted every five years.” The template, however, intends a broader evaluation of the schools themselves *under the stewardship of the dean* and not the dean as an individual administrator. This is in contrast to existing legacy Rutgers policy that focuses on the performance of the dean in several critical areas (quality of relationship with, and care for, students; quality of collegial relationship between the dean and the faculty and/or fellows; performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff; performance of financial and strategic management of the unit’s resources; and overall performance).

The FPAC recommends changes to the RBHS School/Institute Template (section C2), which serves as guidance for the review of each RBHS school, institute, and department, to include language specific to an evaluation of the dean’s performance.

C. Current Policies

C1. Periodic evaluation of academic deans (Legacy Rutgers)

The procedure for the evaluation of administrators by faculty, staff, and students at legacy Rutgers was first proposed by the New Brunswick Faculty Council in March of 2000, which recommended that its Personnel Policy Committee, other faculty governance, and the administration develop a review system for evaluating, at a minimum, all faculty administrators (e.g., directors, deans) and others whose performance impacts teaching, research, and service. In 2001, the FPAC prepared an original policy for adoption by the Senate, which was then reviewed and revised in 2004 and 2009. The current policy for evaluation of deans, intended for those who serve at Rutgers-New Brunswick, Rutgers-Newark, and Rutgers-Camden, is detailed in the FPAC response to Charge A-0812 Evaluation of Administrators Part I: Evaluation of Academic Deans.⁴ The process was updated by Rutgers administration post-integration⁵; the document currently used as guidelines for periodic decanal review is posted to the website of Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA)

¹ <https://academicaffairs.rutgers.edu/sites/academicaffairs/files/Process%20for%20the%20Evaluation%20of%20Academic%20Deans-Final.pdf>

² <https://academicaffairs.rutgers.edu/sites/academicaffairs/files/Process%20for%20the%20Evaluation%20of%20Chancellors%20-%20Final.pdf>

³ <http://senate.rutgers.edu/RBHSSchoolInstituteReviewDocumentGuidelinesTemplate.pdf>

⁴ <http://senate.rutgers.edu/FPAConA0812DeansEvaluationsPartIAsAdoptedFinalMarch2010.pdf>

⁵ *New Jersey Medical and Health Sciences Education Restructuring Act, 2012*

(see footnote 1), and for ease of reference in this report, is found in Appendix I.

C2. Periodic evaluation of academic deans in RBHS

A formal policy that addresses decanal review at RBHS is lacking, although a policy of broader scope that intends an evaluation of the schools under the stewardship of the dean, *but not the dean as an individual administrator*, is documented in the RBHS School/Institute Review Template (for ease of reference, Appendix II).⁶ The template provides guidelines for established periodic reviews (every five years) of each school, institute, and academic department. These reviews are to be established as a “wise practice...intended to be applied uniformly throughout RBHS.”

D. Considerations

The legacy Rutgers policy (section C1) is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the evaluation of qualities specific to RBHS deans (such as primary responsibility for unit health care and service programs), and thus would require minimal modification. However, given that RBHS intends to periodically review all of its schools and institutes, the RBHS School/Institute Template (section C2), which serves as guidance, could be modified to include language specific to the evaluation of the dean’s performance. The FPAC considers this option as optimal and has suggested changes to the template based on the legacy decanal review process. In doing so, however, the committee expressed concern that although the dean/director should enjoy sufficient latitude to structure the external review of the unit as he/she best sees fit, a more arms-length approach is needed for appointing members to the committee who will ultimately evaluate the dean as an administrator. Thus, some duties ascribed to the dean/director in the RBHS School/Institute Template have been delegated to the chancellor. Indeed, the attempt to overlay the decanal review process onto the RBHS School/Institute Template has created an awkward document that might benefit from a thorough revision to remove redundancy and clarify the process.

Note: the School/Institute Review Template was downloaded to a Word file, and changes to the existing document are indicated as italics and underline (additions) and strike-through (deletions).

School/Institute Review Template

RBHS GUIDELINES

Objective:

As a best practice and to ensure academic excellence, rigor in educational and research programs, quality in health care delivery, and to fully engage faculty in the school governance, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) recommends a formal *and independent* review of each school, *its dean*, institute, and academic department within a school to be conducted every five years. In conjunction with school and institute bylaws and procedures, the following guidance shall be followed to ensure a consistent review across schools, institutes, departments, and programs and maintain standards of excellence in achieving RBHS core missions.

The objective of these reviews shall be:

- 1) To assure ongoing excellence within the discipline(s);
- 2) To assess the alignment of the program’s goals with the strategic goals of the school or institute, RBHS, and Rutgers University;
- 3) To provide the department with opportunities for review and assessment of directions, goals, strengths, areas for improvement in education, research, and patient care;
- 4) To assess the present and future programmatic and operational needs to achieve stated goals;
- 5) To provide a mechanism for faculty to express their views on the performance and responsiveness of leadership.

⁶ <http://senate.rutgers.edu/RBHSSchoolInstituteReviewDocumentGuidelinesTemplate.pdf>, page 1.

Overview of Procedure:

The bylaws of several RBHS schools call for the periodic review of departments and chairs and outline general procedures. This is a wise practice, and is intended to be applied uniformly throughout RBHS. The following guidelines are recommended to ensure open, objective, and thorough reviews at the school and institute levels.

To conduct the review of the school/institute and its leadership, ~~and in consultation with the Chancellor,~~ a School/Institute Review Committee shall be appointed by the Chancellor in consultation with the dean/director and provided with a committee charge to guide ~~to the process, which is described in detail below.~~ ~~The dean/director shall select the chair and vice chair of the committee. The committee should primarily be composed of senior faculty members from within the unit, plus others as described below.~~ The review process should also include a site visit by external reviewers who have national reputations and particular expertise in the discipline or field of the school/institute.

These reviews should be prospective rather than retrospective and focus on the school's/institute's efforts to be in the vanguard of the respective disciplines and academic health centers nationally. The process should provide independent and objective feedback on performance and goals, be collaborative and collegial, and instill confidence in the faculty.

The School/Institute Review Committee ~~and in consultation with~~ the dean/director will initiate, name, and organize a series of review committees for each of the major departments of a school or programs of an institute. Members of departmental/program review committees will be primarily senior members of departments/programs other than the one being reviewed. Typically, department/program reviews should be completed within 90 days of the appointment of the committee. Reports from each department/program review will become important resource documents for the use of the School/Institute Review Committee in conducting its preliminary research and preparation of their final comprehensive report.

As part of the evaluation of schools, the School/Institute Review Committee will include an independent review of the dean as the steward of the unit as well as an administrator, gathering data as appropriate in critical areas such as 1) the quality of relationship with, and care for, the appropriate student and patient populations; 2) collegial relationships between the dean and faculty; 3) performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff; 4) performance of financial and strategic management of resources; and 5) overall performance.

The School/Institute Review Committee should hold a series of meetings in preparation for a site visit by the external reviewers. The site visit should be an in-person visit over the course of one to two days. The internal and external reviewers ~~must~~ ~~should~~ meet with faculty, staff, and administration from the institute or school. The site visit should begin with a charge from the dean/director and conclude with a meeting with the review committee, followed by a final meeting with the dean/director, the chair of the review committee, the campus provost, and other leadership as needed. Typically the final meeting will then be a private meeting with the RBHS chancellor. At those concluding meetings, the external reviewers share their findings and recommendations prior to issuing a formal written report.

The final work product of the School/Institute Review Committee, after its series of meetings have concluded, is to produce a formal written report of its review, including its observations, findings, and recommendations. The external reviewers' report ~~and the full report of the evaluation of the dean~~ will be appended to form the comprehensive review document ~~that is~~ ~~The final document~~ is submitted to the Chancellor, the provost, the dean/director, and chancellor, and the chair of the Rutgers University Senate. The document is also distributed to the unit; however, the full report of the dean evaluation is replaced with the non-confidential summary prepared by the School/Institute Review Committee (see below).

Appointment of the Ad Hoc Internal School/Institute Review Committee

After consulting relevant school bylaws, and in consultation with the ~~chancellor,~~ dean/director, the chancellor shall appoint the members of the School/Institute Review Committee ~~and designate a chair.~~ The committee ~~shall~~ ~~should~~ be

representative of the school/institute faculty and ~~will be~~ composed of seven to ten senior faculty members⁷ who shall constitute the majority of the committee. Five committee members are selected by the chancellor as follows: 1) the appropriate governance body of the unit will submit a slate of ten faculty members, or 50% of the faculty, whichever is smaller, from within the unit, from which three will be chosen; 2) The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit a slate of eight faculty members from outside the unit, from which two will be chosen; faculty from related units should be preferred in the composition of the slate. The remaining faculty are selected by the chancellor in consultation with the dean/director. The committee should also include representatives from school administration, RBHS administration, senior faculty from RBHS from outside the program, Rutgers University at large, or clinical affiliates whenever appropriate. The dean/director may ask to exclude potential members of the School/Institute Review Committee based on conflicts of interest. These requests must be provided in a letter addressed to the chancellor and must include a justification for the exclusion of each member. The committee will meet as a body to select its own chair and vice-chair.

Development of a Resource Document by the School/Institute

A letter is sent by the dean/director early in the academic year in which the review will occur formally notifying the school/institute faculty members that the review process has been initiated, and inviting input to the named School/Institute Review Committee. The committee will request of the dean/director a resource document, which will serve as the principal reference document for the committee and the external site visitors. The report shall include:

- An overview of the unit's history;
- Current unit organizational charts;
- The unit's academic plan - outlining the directions in education, research, and administration for the next ~~three~~-five years;
- Descriptions of the education, research, clinical, and community service programs of the unit;
- Listings of unit faculty, fellows, residents, resources, accomplishments, other pertinent data, ~~etc.~~ as appropriate based on current standards (for example, for a basic science department, the number of grants, publications, h-index, etc.);
- Reports from all individual department/program reviews;
- A statement from the dean detailing responsibilities, accomplishments, and vision and strategic plan for the unit.

The format of the document is likely to vary for clinical programs and basic science programs. The report is submitted by the dean/director to members of the committee, and the external site visitors.

School/Institute Committee Meetings

The school/institute review committees typically hold one or more meetings to develop a full understanding of the school/institute under review and its proposed academic plan. The chancellor or designee and the dean/director will attend the first meeting of the school/institute review committee to provide the committee charge.

In addition, the initial meeting(s) should build the foundation for the review process and include: 1) discussions of potential site visitors; 2) selection of individuals for the committee to interview; 3) creation of subcommittees as needed, e.g., to organize departmental reviews; 4) the meeting schedule; and 5) other information needed in the resource document.

Subsequent meetings shall include discussions with department chairs and the school/institute faculty and staff, individually or in groups, and other faculty members and others outside the department. The dean/director shall assign to the committee a staff member who shall be responsible for all interview scheduling, meeting room reservations, adequate documentation of each meeting, and travel arrangements for site visitors.

The committee's final meetings will focus on drafting and completion of the final report.

⁷ Full-time faculty members with three or more years of service at Rutgers and who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors, or academic directors.

Solicitation of Comments on School/Institute Under Review

The committee chair shall send a memorandum outlining the review to the faculty of the unit under review, other school department chairs, directors of centers and/or institutes associated with the school, the leaders and members of other institutes and schools, and others as appropriate soliciting constructive comments and the unit and on the resource document, and inviting them to request a meeting with the committee.

Solicitation and Summary of Input on the Evaluation of Dean

An on-line survey should be formulated for distribution, where provisions are made for narrative comments as well as a series of multiple-choice evaluations. The multiple-choice evaluations will include the five performance areas listed above plus any unit-specific additions. Separate surveys should be designed for different constituencies of the dean (such as faculty, staff, and students) and must provide privacy assurances for respondents. The surveys will be administered by the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTARR), which will also tabulate the numerical results and provide a transcript of the written comments, but evaluation of survey results is the responsibility of the committee. The committee will write a summary of written comments and correlate them with the numerical results. Generic templates, as well as further guidance for this portion of the review, may be solicited from the SVPAA.

The committee may wish to collect additional survey data, such as respondent's familiarity with dean's performance in position, quality of faculty and program development, fairness and ethics, leadership, communication, functional competence, commitment to diversity, and interpersonal skills. Also, other means of soliciting input, such as discussions summarized in narrative form (similar to departmental narratives used in faculty personnel decisions), letters and communications from individuals commenting on the dean's performance, results of interviews or focus group discussions, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved.

The committee will prepare a full report and send it to the dean/director for a written response. The committee may choose to modify the original evaluation in response to the dean/director's reply, particularly in cases where there are errors of fact or interpretation. The committee shall also prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings that will serve as feedback to unit constituents. The chancellor and dean/director will have an opportunity to review and suggest changes on the non-confidential summary before it is distributed.

Selection of Site Visitors by the School/Institute Review Committee

The involvement of external site visitors in the review process provides an opportunity for the school/institute review committee and the dean/director to obtain a wide perspective of trends in the discipline of the unit under review. The selection of site visitors shall be a participatory and consultative process, involving the chancellor and committee members in consultation with the dean/director ~~the dean/director and the committee members, and be done in consultation with the chancellor.~~ *Specifically as for the nomination of the School/Unit Review Committee, the dean/director may ask to exclude potential site visitors based on the existence of documentable conflicts of interest.* After the school/institute review committee and the chancellor ~~dean/director~~ agree on a final slate of external consultants (usually three names and two alternates); the names, together with brief bio sketches of each, are sent to the chancellor who schedules a meeting with the committee chair and dean/director to finalize the selection of external consultants. The ~~dean/director~~ chancellor sends a formal letter of invitation to the top three consultants, which is followed up by communication from the committee chair. If one or more are unable to accept the invitation extended, alternate consultant(s) receive a formal invitation.

School/Institute Review Committee Report

The school/institute review committee determines the overall structure and contents of its draft final report and should include an executive summary of recommendations written by the committee chair. The report should be written in such a way that it can be shared with the dean/director, faculty and staff, the Provost, and RBHS senior leadership. If necessary, the chair may also submit a confidential memorandum to the dean/director and/or the chancellor containing

any recommendations or information that would not be appropriate for inclusion in the final report. Reports will differ depending on the unit under review and the pertinent issues raised during the review.

Site Visit by External Reviewers

Once the site visitors have accepted the invitation to serve, the school/institute committee chair, or designee, arranges the site visit dates and travel arrangements. The school shall pay for the travel arrangements. Prior to the site visit, each visitor is sent the department report for review and a list of committee members. The visitors are asked to provide their current CV, which is distributed to internal attendees to site visit meetings.

The site visit generally occurs over two consecutive days of meetings. The dean/director, all department chairs, the committee members, and the visitors should all have an opportunity to propose individuals to meet with during the site visit. The visitors interview the department chairs, key faculty, and staff from the department under review, students, residents, various members of other departments whose activities relate to the department, as well as RBHS senior leadership where appropriate. The resource document is provided to the site visitors in advance of their visit.

The review shall be conducted in the format of an NIH site visit. The agenda is developed and approved by the school/institute review committee and is flexible to accommodate additional requests by the visitors. The proceedings begin with brief remarks by the chancellor regarding the unit under review and any institutional priorities that might have an impact. The chancellor presents the visitors with their charge for the review. This initial meeting provides the visitors the opportunity to ask any questions or request any information that they determine necessary. The visitors speak next with the dean/director. At this meeting the dean/director provides an overview of the history of the unit, an assessment of the current state of the unit, relevant goals, outcomes, and accomplishments during the past five years, and his/her strategic plans for the future. The balance of the day and the following morning are generally devoted to interviewing faculty, administrative staff, and students.

Interviews continue on the second day and typically conclude with another session with the dean/director. This provides an opportunity for the visitors and the dean/director to ask questions and follow up on any unfinished business or issues that have arisen from their interviews. The visitors should then meet alone in a working session to discuss and summarize the review and develop an outline which will later become their report. Following their deliberations, the visitors first meet with the school/institute review committee members to discuss their preliminary findings and to ask any remaining questions. The visitors then have a final meeting with the dean/director, referred to as the exit interview, to discuss the same. Also present at the exit interview are the chancellor, campus provost or his/her designee, the school/institute review committee chair, and other leadership as appropriate to discuss the review and the consultants' recommendations.

The visitors are then asked to produce a concise, yet comprehensive report submitted to the ~~chancellor~~ ~~dean/director~~ dean/director which reflects their assessment and recommendations. In addition, they may also submit a separate letter to the ~~dean/director~~ chancellor, to include confidential recommendations or information that would not be appropriate to include in the report. The report should be provided no later than three weeks after the site visit. The external report should be considered an "open" document that can be made available to all concerned and ultimately become an appendix to the report of the ad hoc review committee.

Comprehensive Review Committee Report/Post-Review Activities

The school/institute review committee chair is responsible to coordinate the site visitors' report together with the committee report to develop the final comprehensive review report *to which the full dean's evaluation is appended*. After the final document is reviewed by the school/institute review committee chair, he/she meets with the chancellor to discuss findings and recommendations. Following this, the chancellor meets with the dean/director to discuss the review and its implications on the future plans of the unit. Once this meeting is complete, the comprehensive review report is considered final and a copy is sent to the campus provost, the chancellor, and the chair of the Rutgers University Senate. The dean/director is sent a copy, appended not with the full dean evaluation but with the non-confidential summary, to share with the unit.

A copy of the final comprehensive review report shall be maintained by the school/institute and a copy sent to archives.

Sample Timeline

The following sample time is proposed for the comprehensive review of a school/institute and the dean/director:

Fall Semester - Departmental Reviews

- 1) September - Kickoff meeting with faculty outlining departmental review process, dean/director review process, school/institute review - introducing purpose of the review, concepts, and preliminary data requests. Solicitation of potential nominees for school faculty review committee members and external visitors.
- 2) September 15 - Departmental review process begins, dean/director appoints committees, data collection initiated, committees hold organizational meetings.
- 3) October - Departmental reviews continue.
- 4) November/December - Departmental committee reports are drafted.
- 5) January - Conclusion of departmental review processes, all reports due to dean by January 15.

Spring Semester - School/Institute Review

- 6) February - School/Institute Review Committee is convened; reports provided to committee, data is presented to committee; review of the school dean is initiated.
- 7) March - Site visit by external reviewers, dean meets with review committee; dean review surveys are distributed and other input gathered.
- 8) April/May - School/Institute Report is drafted, to which the dean evaluation is appended; a non-confidential summary is prepared.
- 9) May 15 - Review committee reviews draft report, provides opportunity for dean/director to respond.
- 10) June 1 - Report presented to Chancellor.
- 11) July - Final report published - distributed to faculty.

E. Summary of suggested changes to the RBHS School/Institute Review Template

The FPAC concludes that the RBHS School/Institute Template should: 1) include an evaluation of the dean as an administrator; 2) specify a process for the evaluation; and 3) ensure that results of the evaluation are distributed to the unit in the form of a non-confidential summary. The changes, in summary are:

Page 3, paragraph 2

Since the review includes an evaluation of the dean as administrator, the School/Institute Review Committee shall be appointed by the *Chancellor in consultation with the dean or director of the unit.*

Page 3, paragraph 5

Performance areas to be evaluated include:

“critical areas such as 1) the quality of relationship with, and care for, the appropriate student and patient populations, 2) collegial relationships between the dean and faculty, 3) performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff, 4) performance of financial and strategic management of resources, and 5) overall performance.”

Page 3, paragraph 7

The “*full report of the dean evaluation*” shall be appended to the comprehensive review document, and that a “*non-confidential summary*” is distributed to the unit by way of feedback at the conclusion of the evaluation.

Page 3, paragraph 8

Faculty composition of the School/Institute Review Committee is amended to parallel the legacy Rutgers decanal evaluation policy: “*full-time faculty with three or more years of service at Rutgers and who do not hold administrative appointments*” (other than chair or academic director) are eligible to serve. Five of these faculty are selected by the chancellor from slates of submitted by the unit governing body as well as the Executive Committee of the Rutgers

University Senate. Faculty shall constitute the majority of the internal review committee. The dean/director may ask to exclude potential members of the committee based on conflict of interest.

Page 4, paragraph 2, bullet 7

Pre-meeting documentation should include a “*statement from the dean detailing responsibilities, accomplishments, and vision and strategic plan for the unit.*”

Page 5, paragraph 2

The section describes the form, solicitation, and summary of data for the dean evaluation, which includes an on-line, confidential survey.

An on-line survey should be formulated for distribution, where provisions are made for narrative comments as well as a series of multiple-choice evaluations. The multiple-choice evaluations will include the five performance areas listed above plus any unit-specific additions. Separate surveys should be designed for different constituencies of the dean (such as faculty, staff, and students) and must provide privacy assurances for respondents. The surveys will be administered by the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTARR), which will also tabulate the numerical results and provide a transcript of the written comments, but evaluation of survey results is the responsibility of the committee. The committee will write a summary of written comments and correlate them to with the numerical results. Generic templates, as well as further guidance for this portion of the review, may be solicited from the SVPAA.

The committee may wish to collect additional survey data, such as respondent’s familiarity with dean’s performance in position, quality of faculty and program development, fairness and ethics, leadership, communication, functional competence, commitment to diversity, and interpersonal skills. Also, other means of soliciting input, such as discussions summarized in narrative form (similar to departmental narratives used in faculty personnel decisions), letters and communications from individuals commenting on the dean’s performance, results of interviews or focus group discussions, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved.

The committee will prepare a full report and send it to the dean/director for a written response. The committee may choose to modify the original evaluation in response to the dean/director’s reply, particularly in cases where there are errors of fact or interpretation. The committee shall also prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings that will serve as feedback to unit constituents. The chancellor and dean/director will have an opportunity to review and suggest changes on the non-confidential summary before it is distributed.

Page 6, paragraph 6

Distribution of a non-confidential summary of the dean evaluation to the unit is reiterated.

Page 7, paragraph 3

The spring semester timeline is amended to include steps in the dean evaluation.

F. Recommendation

Be it resolved that the Rutgers University Senate recommends:

A robust evaluation of the performance of the dean be included in the periodic review of each RBHS unit as specified in the RBHS School/Institute Review Template. Suggested amendments (as summarized in section E) to this template are included in this report.

2018-2019 Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee

<i>Farid Alizadeh, Co-Chair</i>	<i>RBS:N/NB, Faculty</i>
<i>Joseph Markert, Co-Chair</i>	<i>RBS:N/NB, Faculty</i>
<i>Anil Ardesna</i>	<i>RSDM, Faculty</i>
<i>Mary Jo Bugel</i>	<i>RBHS At-Large, Faculty</i>
<i>Kenneth Carty</i>	<i>CCAS, Student</i>

Gregory DiLalo	New Brunswick Staff
Wayne Eastman	RBS:N/NB, Faculty
Robert Eisenstein	RWJMS, Faculty
Vivian Fernandez	VP Faculty and Staff Resources, non-senator
Anthony Filippelli	PTL-RBHS, Faculty
Sally Goldfarb	Law-C, Faculty
Carlos Gonzalez	Engineering, Student
Ann Gould	SEBS, Faculty
Jerome Langer	RWJMS, Faculty
Eleanor LaPointe	SAS-NB, Faculty
Donna Nickitas	Dean, Nursing-C, Administration
Kaylah Norris	Camden Staff
Virendra Pandey	NJMS, Faculty
Boris Paskhover	NJMS, Faculty
Nicholas Ponzio	NJMS, Faculty
Jonathan Potter	SCI Dean, Administration
Kristen Powell	SSW, Faculty
Cynthia Saltzman	PTL-C, Faculty
Laura Schneider	SAS-NB, Faculty
Federico Sesti	RWJMS, Faculty
Marc Steinberg	At-Large RBHS, Faculty
Karen Thompson	PTL-NB, Faculty

Appendix I. Process for the Evaluation of Academic Deans, July 13, 2010

This process has been formulated through a series of iterations from the Rutgers University Senate and the president of the University, and applies to the academic dean of each academic unit of the University.

1. Each academic dean shall normally be evaluated by faculty, staff and students in the unit every five years, but an evaluation can be triggered at any time by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA), the dean's chancellor, by the dean, or by the unit's faculty. The latter proceeds as follows: a petition by 25% of the unit's tenured faculty, or by 25% of the students of the unit, to the faculty secretary of the unit, or equivalent person, triggers a secret ballot docketed for the next faculty meeting where the question of whether to have an out-of-cycle evaluation of the dean, to commence at the current semester, is decided by majority vote of those voting. An evaluation by petition can only be requested once between regular evaluations.
2. The initial evaluation for newly appointed deans should be earlier than the fifth year so that evaluations by faculty, staff and students should not coincide with the 5-year review by the dean's chancellor. Such evaluations should be carried out in year 4, since this is expected to allow enough time for the deans to act on suggestions resulting from the evaluation. A single semester should normally suffice for completion of the evaluation.
3. At the direction of the SVPAA, the dean's chancellor will meet with the unit faculty and the dean to initiate the process. In most cases, the unit faculty will also be the "appropriate constituency body." In units where the faculty do not regularly meet as a body, an appropriately representative body shall be identified by the respective chancellor at the onset of the evaluation process.
4. The University Senate will be informed by the SVPAA in case of major delays or irregularities.
5. An ad hoc Dean Evaluation Committee (DEC), the majority of which must be faculty members¹, will be formed by the dean's chancellor as follows:
 - a. The appropriate governance body of the unit will submit a slate of ten faculty members¹ or 50% of the faculty, whichever is smaller, from within the unit, from which three will be chosen.

¹ Full time faculty members with three or more years of service at Rutgers, who (with the exception of RBHS) are tenured, and who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors or undergraduate directors.

- b. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will submit a slate of eight faculty members¹ from without the unit, from which two will be chosen. Faculty from related units should be preferred in the composition of the slate.
 - c. Up to three administrators may be appointed by the dean's chancellor.
6. The DEC will meet as a body to elect its chair.
7. The dean will be asked by their chancellor to submit to the committee, within a reasonable timeframe, a statement detailing responsibilities and accomplishments that will include data as well as his/her vision and strategic plan for the unit. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the DEC. The dean's statement should be made available to those providing input to the process.
8. The DEC, in consultation with the dean's chancellor, will decide on whether to include in its membership representatives from among the staff, students, alumni, or other constituencies (from within or without the unit or even the University) with whom the dean may have substantial contact. In so doing, the DEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty¹. The DEC will also decide on the manner of choosing such members. In the case of student membership, the student representative(s) should be chosen from among student senators representing the unit, and/or officers of the appropriate student governing association.
9. The DEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the dean and the dean's chancellor. In so doing, the committee shall enjoy significant latitude, but will need to ensure that meaningful faculty (including PTLs and annuals), student and staff input is received during the evaluation process, and that the process provides for anonymity of respondents who request it. Furthermore, in addition to any unit-specific questions or criteria, DEC's will include in the review process evaluations of the dean in the following areas, as appropriate to the individual unit:
 - Quality of relationship with, and care for, students
 - Quality of collegial relationship between the dean and the faculty and/or fellows
 - Performance in personnel issues involving faculty and staff
 - Performance of financial and strategic management of the unit's resources
 - Overall performance

- a. A survey should be formulated by the DEC. Provision should be made for narrative comments as well as a series of multiple-choice evaluations. The multiple-choice evaluations will include the five performance areas listed above plus any unit-specific additions from the unit faculty.

Generic templates for a faculty and a staff survey are appended as Appendix I (faculty) and Appendix II (staff). They are only meant to be of assistance to the DEC, which can add, amend, or delete elements as appropriate for the particular unit. These surveys have been formulated based on the initial survey used by the School of Communication and Information. Nevertheless, all previous survey formats should be kept by the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (“CTAAR”) and be made available to the DEC for consideration.

Analysis of the data will be programmed so that means and other statistics will be standard outputs, along with anonymous listing of the narrative comments. This summary of respondents’ input is all that will be made available to those having access to survey results. The surveys must provide privacy assurances for the faculty, staff, students and other respondents. Use of an electronic survey is recommended, but for units using an online survey, non-electronic copies of the survey instrument will be provided to faculty, students or staff who do not wish to participate in the electronic version, and the DEC will need to determine how to protect the confidentiality of those respondents and how to ensure that their views are included in the overall evaluation. Response rates for the survey by type of respondent (tenured and tenure-track faculty, other faculty, student, administrative and non-administrative staff, other) should be reported along with the survey results.

Units may wish to collect additional data, such as:

- Respondent’s familiarity with dean’s performance in position
- Quality of faculty and program development
- Fairness and ethics
- Leadership
- Communication
- Functional competence
- Commitment to diversity
- Interpersonal skills

- b. The survey will be carried out by CTAAR. Numerical results will be tabulated by CTAAR, and the written comments will be provided. Nevertheless, evaluating the data and formulating the report is the task of the DEC.
- c. The committee or a subcommittee of the DEC will write a summary of the written comments and will correlate them with the numerical results (if any). The DEC will consider survey response rates and distribution of responses in compiling the report.
10. A thorough evaluation process should be carried out by the DEC. Additional input could include discussion summarized in narrative form (similar to departmental narratives used in faculty personnel decisions), or letters and communications from individuals commenting on the dean’s performance, as long as anonymity of the individuals responding can be preserved if desired by those respondents. Units are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The dean's chancellor is encouraged to make available some secretarial support to the DEC, if needed.
11. Once completed, the DEC shall send the report to the dean, along with a request for a written response. The DEC may choose to modify the original evaluation report in response to the dean’s reply, particularly in cases where the dean has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation. The DEC will append the response of the dean to its final report, and the chair of the evaluation committee should directly distribute one copy each to the president, the SVPAA, the dean's chancellor and the chair of the University Senate. It is expected that the results will be confidential and that those with access to the results will respect that confidentiality.
12. The DEC will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings, and will mail or e-mail it to the faculty of the unit. In preparing this summary, the DEC may also wish to summarize the response of the dean. The contents should include non-confidential information at the discretion of the DEC. It is suggested that some results of the survey be part of the feedback summary. The dean’s chancellor will have the opportunity to review and approve

the summary before it is distributed to the faculty. The DEC will decide whether to share the non-confidential summary with other constituencies that have provided input to the evaluation.

13. The chancellor should meet with the dean to discuss the evaluation.
14. The chancellor should then meet with the dean and the faculty to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to unit policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

Appendix II. RBHS School/Institute Review Template

School/Institute Review Template

RBHS GUIDELINES

Objective:

As a best practice and to ensure academic excellence, rigor in educational and research programs, quality in health care delivery, and to fully engage faculty in the school governance, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) recommends a formal review of each school, institute, and academic department within a school to be conducted every five years. In conjunction with school and institute bylaws and procedures, the following guidance shall be followed to ensure a consistent review across schools, institutes, departments, and programs and maintain standards of excellence in achieving RBHS core missions.

The objective of these reviews shall be:

- 1) To assure ongoing excellence within the discipline(s);
- 2) To assess the alignment of the program's goals with the strategic goals of the school or institute, RBHS, and Rutgers University;
- 3) To provide the department with opportunities for review and assessment of directions, goals, strengths, areas for improvement in education, research, and patient care;
- 4) To assess the present and future programmatic and operational needs to achieve stated goals;
- 5) To provide a mechanism for faculty to express their views on the performance and responsiveness of leadership.

Overview of Procedure:

The bylaws of several RBHS schools call for the periodic review of departments and chairs and outline general procedures. This is a wise practice, and is intended to be applied uniformly throughout RBHS. The following guidelines are recommended to ensure open, objective, and thorough reviews at the school and institute levels.

To conduct the review of the school/institute and its leadership, and in consultation with the Chancellor, a School/Institute Review Committee shall be appointed by the dean/director and provided with a committee charge to guide to process. The dean/director shall select the chair and vice chair of the committee. The committee should primarily be composed of senior faculty members from within the unit, plus others as described below. The review process should also include a site visit by external reviewers who have national reputations and particular expertise in the discipline or field of the school/institute.

These reviews should be prospective rather than retrospective and focus on the school's/institute's efforts to be in the vanguard of the respective disciplines and academic health centers nationally. The process should provide independent and objective feedback on performance and goals, be collaborative and collegial, and instill confidence in the faculty.

The School/Institute Review Committee and the dean/director will initiate, name, and organize a series of review committees for each of the major departments of a school or programs of an institute. Members of departmental/program review committees will be primarily senior members of departments/programs other than the one being reviewed. Typically, department/program reviews should be completed within 90 days of the appointment of the committee. Reports from each department/program review will become important resource documents for the use of the School/Institute Review Committee in conducting its preliminary research and preparation of their final comprehensive report.

The School/Institute Review Committee should hold a series of meetings in preparation for a site visit by the external reviewers. The site visit should be an in person visit over the course of one to two days. The internal and external reviewers should meet with faculty, staff, and administration from the institute or school. The site visit should begin with a charge from the dean/director and conclude with a meeting with the review committee, followed by a final meeting with

the dean/director, the chair of the review committee, the campus provost, and other leadership as needed. Typically the final meeting will then be a private meeting with the RBHS chancellor. At those concluding meetings, the external reviewers share their findings and recommendations prior to issuing a formal written report.

The final work product of the School/Institute Review Committee, after its series of meetings have concluded, is to produce a formal written report of its review, including its observations, findings, and recommendations. The external reviewers' report will be appended to form the comprehensive review document. The final document is to be submitted to the dean and chancellor.

Appointment of the Ad Hoc Internal Review Committee

After consulting relevant school bylaws, and in consultation with the chancellor, the dean/director shall appoint the members of the School/Institute Review Committee and designate a chair. The committee should be representative of the school/institute faculty and will be composed of seven to ten senior faculty members. The committee should also include representatives from school administration, RBHS administration, senior faculty from RBHS from outside the program, Rutgers University at large, or clinical affiliates whenever appropriate.

Development of a Resource Document by the School/Institute

A letter is sent by the dean/director early in the academic year in which the review will occur formally notifying the school/institute faculty members that the review process has been initiated, and inviting input to the named School/Institute Review Committee. The committee will request of the dean/director a resource document, which will serve as the principal reference document for the committee and the external site visitors. The report shall include:

- An overview of the unit's history;
- Current unit organizational charts;
- The unit's academic plan - outlining the directions in education, research, and administration for the next three-five years;
- Descriptions of the education, research, clinical, and community service programs of the unit;
- Listings of unit faculty, fellows, residents, resources, accomplishments, other pertinent data, etc. as appropriate;
- Reports from all individual department/program reviews.

The format of the document is likely to vary for clinical programs and basic science programs. The report is submitted by the dean/director to members of the committee, and the external site visitors.

School/Institute Committee Meetings

The school/institute review committees typically hold one or more meetings to develop a full understanding of the school/institute under review and its proposed academic plan. The dean/director will attend the first meeting of the school/institute review committee to provide the committee charge.

In addition, the initial meeting(s) should build the foundation for the review process and include: 1) discussions of potential site visitors; 2) selection of individuals for the committee to interview; 3) creation of subcommittees as needed, e.g., to organize departmental reviews; 4) the meeting schedule; 5) other information needed in the resource document.

Subsequent meetings shall include discussions with department chairs and the school/institute faculty and staff, individually or in groups, and other faculty members and others outside the department. The dean/director shall assign to the committee a staff member who shall be responsible for all interview scheduling, meeting room reservations, adequate documentation of each meeting, and travel arrangements for site visitors.

The committee's final meetings will focus on drafting and completion of the final report.

Solicitation of Comments on School/Institute Under Review

The committee chair shall send a memorandum outlining the review to the faculty of the unit under review, other school department chairs, directors of centers and/or institutes associated with the school, the leaders and members of other institutes and schools, and others as appropriate soliciting constructive comments and the unit and on the resource document, and inviting them to request a meeting with the committee.

Selection of Site Visitors by the School/Institute Review Committee

The involvement of external site visitors in the review process provides an opportunity for the school/institute review committee and the dean/director to obtain a wide perspective of trends in the discipline of the unit under review. The selection of site visitors shall be a participatory and consultative process, involving the dean/director and the committee members, and be done in consultation with the chancellor. After the school/institute review committee and dean/director agree on a final slate of external consultants, (usually three names and two alternates), the names, together with brief bio sketches of each, are sent to the chancellor who schedules a meeting with the committee chair and dean/director to finalize the selection of external consultants. The dean/director sends a formal letter of invitation to the top three consultants, which is followed up by communication from the committee chair. If one or more are unable to accept the invitation extended, alternate consultant(s) receive a formal invitation.

School/Institute Review Committee Report

The school/institute review committee determines the overall structure and contents of its draft final report and should include an executive summary of recommendations written by the committee chair. The report should be written in such a way that it can be shared with the dean/director, faculty and staff, the Provost, and RBHS senior leadership. If necessary, the chair may also submit a confidential memorandum to the dean/director and/or the chancellor containing any recommendations or information that would not be appropriate for inclusion in the final report. Reports will differ depending on the unit under review and the pertinent issues raised during the review.

Site Visit by External Reviewers

Once the site visitors have accepted the invitation to serve, the school/institute committee chair, or designee, arranges the site visit dates and travel arrangements. The school shall pay for the travel arrangements. Prior to the site visit, each visitor is sent the department report for review and a list of committee members. The visitors are asked to provide their current CV, which is distributed to internal attendees to site visit meetings.

The site visit generally occurs over two consecutive days of meetings. The dean/director, all department chairs, the committee members, and the visitors should all have an opportunity to propose individuals to meet with during the site visit. The visitors interview the department chairs, key faculty, and staff from the department under review, students, residents, various members of other departments whose activities relate to the department, as well as RBHS senior leadership where appropriate. The resource document is provided to the site visitors in advance of their visit.

The review shall be conducted in the format of an NIH site visit. The agenda is developed and approved by the school/institute review committee and is flexible to accommodate additional requests by the visitors. The proceedings begin with brief remarks by the chancellor regarding the unit under review and any institutional priorities that might have an impact. The chancellor presents the visitors with their charge for the review. This initial meeting provides the visitors the opportunity to ask any questions or request any information that they determine necessary. The visitors speak next with the dean/director. At this meeting the dean/director provides an overview of the history of the unit, an assessment of the current state of the unit, relevant goals, outcomes, and accomplishments during the past five years, and his/her strategic plans for the future. The balance of the day and the following morning are generally devoted to interviewing faculty, administrative staff, and students.

Interviews continue on the second day and typically conclude with another session with the dean/director. This provides an opportunity for the visitors and the dean/director to ask questions and follow up on any unfinished business or issues that have arisen from their interviews. The visitors should then meet alone in a working session to discuss and summarize the review and develop an outline which will later become their report. Following their deliberations, the visitors first meet with the school/institute review committee members to discuss their preliminary findings and to ask any remaining

questions. The visitors then have a final meeting with the dean/director, referred to as the exit interview, to discuss the same. Also present at the exit interview are the chancellor, campus provost or his/her designee, the school/institute review committee chair, and other leadership as appropriate to discuss the review and the consultants' recommendations.

The visitors are then asked to produce a concise, yet comprehensive report submitted to the dean/director, which reflects their assessment and recommendations. In addition, they may also submit a separate letter to the dean/director and chancellor, to include confidential recommendations or information that would not be appropriate to include in the report. The report should be provided no later than three weeks after the site visit. The external report should be considered an "open" document that can be made available to all concerned and ultimately become an appendix to the report of the ad hoc review committee.

Comprehensive Review Committee Report/Post-Review Activities

The school/institute review committee chair is responsible to coordinate the site visitors' report together with the committee report to develop the final comprehensive review report. After the final document is reviewed by the school/institute review committee chair, he/she meets with the chancellor to discuss findings and recommendations. Following this, the chancellor meets with the dean/director to discuss the review and its implications on the future plans of the unit. Once this meeting is complete, the comprehensive review report is considered final and a copy is sent to the campus provost and the chancellor. The dean/director is sent a copy to share with the unit.

A copy of the final comprehensive review report shall be maintained by the school/institute and a copy sent to archives.

Sample Timeline

The following sample time is proposed for the comprehensive review of a school/institute and the dean/director:

Fall Semester - Departmental Reviews

- 1) September - Kickoff meeting with faculty outlining departmental review process, dean/director review process, school/institute review – introducing purpose of the review, concepts, and preliminary data requests. Solicitation of potential nominees for school faculty review committee members and external visitors.
- 2) September 15 - Departmental review process begins, dean/director appoints committees, data collection initiated, committees hold organizational meetings.
- 3) October - Departmental reviews continue.
- 4) November/December - Departmental committee reports are drafted.
- 5) January - Conclusion of departmental review processes, all reports due to dean by January 15.

Spring Semester - School/Institute Review

- 6) February - School/Institute Review Committee is convened; reports provided to committee, data is presented to committee.
- 7) March - Site visit by external reviewers, dean meets with review committee.
- 8) April/May - School/Institute Report is drafted.
- 9) May 15 - Review committee reviews draft report, provides opportunity for dean/director to respond.
- 10) June 1 - Report presented to Chancellor.
- 11) July - Final report published - distributed to faculty.