

**To: Xan Johnson**

**From: Senate Advisory Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Review of Administration**

**Date: February 2017**

**Re: Activities for 2016-2017 and Recommendations**

### **Request and Background**

The President of the Academic Senate (Bill Johnson) gave the Senate Advisory Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Review of Administration its charge July 2015. The Committee was to explore opportunities to strengthen frequency and transparency of faculty review of administration. For the 2016-2017 academic year, the Committee was to

- Determine if documents from the University of Utah linked to faculty reviews of administration were clear
- Highlight successful reviews conducted at other universities in Utah and the PAC-12
- Draft a recommendation for an updated policy that would be beneficial for the University of Utah

Committee membership included:

- |                            |                                |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| • Caren J. Frost, Chair    | College of Social Work         |
| • Rohit Aggarwal           | College of Business            |
| • Justin Diggle            | College of Fine Arts           |
| • Nadia Cobb               | College of Medicine            |
| • Bruce Gale               | College of Engineering         |
| • Lorie Richards           | College of Health              |
| • Bob Flores, ex officio   | Senate Policy Liaison          |
| • Bill Johnson, ex officio | Academic Senate Past President |
| • Xan Johnson, ex officio  | Academic Senate President      |

### **Findings**

The Committee met in fall 2016 and twice in spring 2017 to continue its discussion and exploration of policies and documents for faculty review of administration at the University of Utah, in the state of Utah, and with PAC-12 institutions. The Committee's findings are discussed in this memo—the information for this document is linked to the April 2016 report provided by this Committee (see attached report).

The Committee requested that Academic Senators send the 2016 report to faculty in their colleges and departments requesting feedback. Very little feedback was obtained; however, faculty across campus noted that the document did not seem to fit their parameters and/or thought it was already been done this way.

## Recommendations

A memo crafted by Bill Johnson was circulated, which captured the essence of what the Committee members were hearing from colleagues (see attached memo). A number of elements in that document fit what this Committee had uncovered in its research and was part of the recommendations in its last report. The components would aid in developing a certain level of transparency across departments and units.

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the committee reviewed the revised version of the SVPAA Guidance Document #4 (date 03/28/16) and shared the document with faculty members across the University of Utah campus. The committee requested feedback from faculty in order to add to the discussion about shared governance aspects of reviewing administration by faculty and sharing that information with faculty in departments and colleges. In addition, the committee continued its review of policies for faculty review of administration among the PAC-12 universities. This memo highlights activities that are recommended that will augment the information provided in the SVPAA Guidance Document #4; however, it does not provide specific recommendations for that document.

Based on information and recommendations from faculty, the following should be considered in policy development to enable faculty to adequately and professionally conduct reviews of administration, e.g., directors, deans, etc. (not in any order):

- Develop procedures for transparency about decisions based on review information should be developed and highlighted for faculty to understand
- Create definitions for various clinical faculty and departments so that it is clear how clinical faculty fit in the education structure of the university
- Create shared power at college governance levels so that each college has a body that reviews leadership and develops set criteria for and information to be gathered interviews that is constructive and useful for college faculty and university administration
- Establish a college/department level board, e.g., college councils that become the permanent review body for administration. This would allow for the development of expertise regarding the specifics of the review process and the importance of maintaining review confidentiality Establishment of a feedback loop so that appropriate review information can be shared with university administration as well as at the college/department levels
- Create of the listing of potential stakeholders who can be invited to participate in reviews of administration, e.g., faculty, staff, students, community partners, etc.—each college/department may have a tailored listing
- Establish policy around mentoring for new administrators so that they will be prepared to meet the requirements for their administration responsibilities and understand on what factors they will be reviewed.
- Utilize a two-step method of inquiry for these reviews (see Administrator Appraisal Committee from University of Colorado at Boulder and surveys attached)
  - In-depth survey that uses performance-based questions on administrators' performance

- Satisfaction survey provided to all faculty asking about non-personnel issues so that the reviews will also include information about context of department/college interactions
- Establish a schedule for regular reviews as well as regular feedback about findings from reviews
- Create a procedure that will ensure that personal and confidential information will not be shared with faculty, staff, and students once reviews are completed

The Committee will present this information to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and to the Academic Senate in Spring 2017.