

Guidelines for Review of Academic Administrators Dean's Version

I. Introduction

The purpose of these Guidelines is to assist the UTHealth President and their appointed Evaluation Committees when conducting evaluations of deans and to ensure consistency among the reviews of deans from all Schools.

Overview and Purpose

The main purpose of the review of deans is to evaluate the dean's effectiveness in promoting the school's missions of education, research, service, and clinical care (if applicable) in a manner that models university and professional values. Because schools vary in size, scope, resources, goals and responsibilities, the Evaluation Committee, in conducting the review, determines the degree to which specific issues are addressed and evaluated and the information that is considered in a given review. General features of the review should include the following:

1. The review should be conducted in light of the dean's position description, specific charges, and assignments from the President, the internal and external environments, and resources available to the dean. The review shall include a self-evaluation by the dean.
2. The review should focus on the dean's overall performance and major issues over the time course of the review rather than on infrequent, isolated matters. The review should consider primarily the dean's administrative performance rather than his/her academic work.
3. The review should consider demonstrated progress in meeting assignments, goals, and identified performance improvement goals specified in annual reviews during the six-year period.
4. The review shall be comprehensive and include input from the school's faculty members, administrators, and staff as determined by the Evaluation Committee for each review.
5. The dean shall have the opportunity to:
 - a. review a draft of the report and comment to the Evaluation Committee before a final report is submitted to the President, and
 - b. review the final report and have the option to submit his/her written comments or response to the President.
6. The review should focus on the six year evaluation period rather than the total length of the dean's appointment.

II. Process

A. Appointment of the Evaluation Committee

The President will appoint six members to an Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee must include two faculty members of any academic rank at assistant professor or above, any track, and any tenure status at the school, two senior administrators from the school, and two senior administrators from the central administration or other schools. The President will appoint a Chair or Co-Chairs from among the six members of the Evaluation Committee.

B. Information to be Considered by the Evaluation Committee in Developing its Report

1. The dean's statement of the school's status at the beginning and over the six-year period of the review period and the dean's self-evaluation. (To be provided by the dean and forwarded to the Evaluation Committee through the President's Office, with the option for the President to comment to the Evaluation Committee).
2. The dean's CV and personal statement of his/her individual contributions to the teaching, research, service programs, and clinical activities (if appropriate) of the school, any departments in which he/she holds an academic appointment, discipline and profession (to be provided by the dean).
3. The job description of the dean's position, any performance expectations or assignments from the President over the period of the review, and all available annual evaluations of the dean. Particular attention should be paid to the dean's achievements of goals and in areas recommended for improvement in annual evaluations and other relevant communications. (To be provided by the President's Office or dean as determined by the President).
4. Input from school's faculty members, administrators, and staff and, as the Evaluation Committee feels appropriate, from students/trainees and other individuals in the school and/or university. Each Evaluation Committee shall determine the most appropriate mechanism to obtain faculty input.
5. The following criteria should be considered in the evaluation of the dean's performance:
 - a. Progress in achieving the school's goals in education, research, service, and clinical activities (as appropriate);
 - b. Support of the school and institutional mission and goals;
 - c. Recruitment, development, mentoring, and retention of department chair, administrative leaders, and staff of the school as determined by the Evaluation Committee;
 - d. Leadership and management;
 - e. Promotion of and support for diversity among faculty, staff, and students of the school;
 - f. Stewardship of resources;
 - g. Communication with faculty, staff, and trainees;
 - h. Promotion of and support for a collegial and professional environment;
 - i. Promotion and demonstration of university values; and
 - j. Enhancement of the university's and school's local, state, and national reputation.

If, after the review of the above materials, the Evaluation Committee needs additional information to conduct the evaluation, the Committee Chair will discuss the Evaluation Committee's reason(s) for requesting the desired information with the President, who will then decide whether it is appropriate and feasible to consider the requested information in the review and if so, how to obtain it. To avoid duplication of effort in collecting and analyzing material, the President and Evaluation Committee should use existing information whenever possible.

The Evaluation Committee may elect to interview the dean or other individuals, e.g., faculty, staff, or trainees of the department or school or other members of the university community.

The dean under review shall be provided a draft report from the Evaluation Committee for review and shall have 14 calendar days from receipt of the draft report to provide comments to the Evaluation Committee. The Committee may consider the dean's comments when preparing the final report.

The Committee will send the final report to the dean and the President. Within seven (7) days the dean has the option to either submit comments on the final report to the President and have them appended to the report, or to inform the president that he/she does not wish to provide comments. Within 14 calendar days after being notified of the dean's choice, the President will forward the final report to the Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer (EVPCAO). The President has the option to provide his/her comments to the report as an appendix.

The EVPCAO will in turn forward the final report, with the dean's and/or President's comments appended if so requested, to the Executive Vice-Chancellor for Health Affairs. The EVPCAO will be responsible for maintaining a copy of the report and any requested appendices.

C. Committee Report

The committee report should include the dates of the six-year period of the review, the names of the Evaluation Committee members, and the following elements:

1. A summary of progress achieving the goals and major areas recommended for improvement in available annual reviews and any other assignments from the President;
2. Recommendations to improve the dean's administrative and leadership roles in the school to enhance achievement of its mission and goals in education, research, service and clinical activities (as appropriate), including any specific recommendations related to the criteria in Section B. 5 (a-j) above;
3. A description and summary evaluation of input from the school's faculty, administrative leaders, and staff, and if requested by the Evaluation Committee input from staff and students/trainees;
4. A narrative summary of the Committee's review and assessment; and
5. An overall assessment of
 - a. Category One – Exceeds Expectations;
 - b. Category Two – Meets Expectations
 - c. Category Three – Does Not Meet Expectations; or
 - d. Category Four – Unsatisfactory.

The final report shall represent the majority opinion of the Evaluation Committee.

D. Review Process and Timeline

The review shall cover a six-year period and be performed in the year immediately following completion of the six year period being assessed. The fiscal year (9/1 – 8/31) that includes the effective date of the administrative appointment shall count as Year One (1) of the six year review period.

[EXAMPLE: A dean is initially appointed on any date within FY 2015. The first six-year evaluation would assess performance from FY 2015 through FY 2020 and would be performed in FY 2021. The second six-year evaluation would assess performance from FY 2021 through FY 2026 and would be performed during FY 2027.]

No later than July 1 of each year, the President's Office shall notify each dean to be reviewed in the coming academic year and shall appoint the Evaluation Committee. The president shall also notify by July 1 all relevant individuals and offices within the school and university that will provide materials to be used by the administrators under review and the Evaluation Committee.

By August 1 of each year the President shall provide a schedule for the review process(es) including timelines and due dates for:

1. submission of required materials from the school and university offices to the dean(s) being reviewed and the Evaluation Committee;
2. submission of draft reports from the Evaluation Committee to the dean(s) under review for his/her comments; and
3. submission of the final Evaluation Committee reports to the president and dean(s).

The schedule should allow sufficient notice for the dean's, school's, and university's offices to collect required information and provide it to the dean and Evaluation Committee.

The President is responsible for submitting all final reports performed in a given year, including any appendices as requested, to the EVPCAO by August 31 of the year in which the reviews are conducted.

The EVPCAO will forward copies of the reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and will maintain a copy for the university records.

*(Adopted by the Office of Academic and Research Affairs, May 15, 2015.
Updated from EVPARA to EVPCAO, June 1, 2017.)*