

New Interim AR 3:16 - Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Policy

Summary. The revisions that were proposed to the Regulations Review Committee in August 2022 for AR 3:16 included two changes that substantively affect the posture of college faculties. One removed the maximum number of years for a dean to go without a summative review (the summative review provides for college faculty input on performance of the dean). The second removed the requirement that the college faculty receive a summary of the outcome of the summative review of the dean. Objections to these changes were submitted by Regs Committee members (DC and DJ), but the revised AR 3:16 was issued anyway with those changes (as an ‘Interim’ AR).

Details.

Issue about maximum number of years before a summative review of the dean.

The college faculty have lost their guarantee of at least the maximum amount of time (previously every 5 years after formative review) that they faculty will have ‘summative review’ opportunity to impact to provost about their dean.

There is no provision in any GR or AR about how long is the ‘term of appointment’ of a dean, nor is such limit stated in the Board PR2. This new AR provision **is thus open-ended** under any GR/AR

Notice that for these administrators there is a guaranteed *upper limit* on how long the person escapes summative review ... not longer than 7 years

Summative Review

1. A summative review ~~must~~shall be conducted for the Provost, executive vice presidents, and deans.
2. The purpose of the summative review is to provide input for establishing future performance goals and expectations and for making compensation and employment decisions.
3. The summative review of deans ~~must~~shall occur at least ~~every five years~~9-months prior to ~~reappointment, beginning three years after the one-time formative review,~~ or at an intervening occasion as might be initiated pursuant to the majority vote of the College Faculty (GR IX). Such a vote ~~is~~shall be coordinated by an elected representative body of that Faculty. ~~A summative review will not be required for deans who do not intend to seek reappointment.~~
4. The summative review of the Provost and executive vice presidents ~~must~~shall occur ~~seven years after the initial appointment, and then~~ at least every ~~seven years thereafter, five years, beginning three years after the one-time formative review,~~ or at an intervening occasion as might be initiated pursuant to the majority vote of the Faculty, in the case of the Provost, or the staff employees, in the case of executive vice presidents (GR IX). Such a vote ~~is~~shall be coordinated by an elected representative body of the Faculty or staff employees.

The College Faculty under this new provision will have no visible policy controlled by AR or GR as to when their dean will ever be ‘summative reviewed’ during the period en route to whenever the ‘administrative in-house’ appointment. There may be an ‘in-house’ provost level policy as to how long the given provost at the time appointments deans, but the college faculty have no knowledge of that policy in any GR or AR. The dean is the **ONLY CAO** in this new AR 3:16 to escape an expressly stated ‘upper limit’ on the years of time until a routine summative review.

This change in AR 3:16 that directly impacts the posture of the College Faculty is NOT being available of the opportunity for the University Senate (or its delegate, the Senate Council) to impact this change in procedures. (Which is contrary to the current AR 1:4 and which is (hopefully) also contrary to the to-be-issued new AR 1:4. Instead, the Regs Committee, on which sits the SC Chair, received the above new AR wording on Thursday Aug. 19 with the note that there will be no Regs Comm meeting about this change and that the SC Chair only has until Tuesday Aug. 23 to submit response to the proposed change).

Issue about maximum number of years faculty receiving a summary of the review outcome.

The previous occasions in which the college faculty/staff received a summary was very, very important to the reassuring transparency of accountability. That is, the faculty could see a summary that their major concerns were heard and impactful.

It is difficult to imagine that the Provost finds it necessary to delete this provision of transparency, because he welcomed Provost Blackwell's dissemination of his (Dean DiPaola's) own summary results to the college (see last screen print below).

If there is some concern about 'privacy' of the actual rendered summary, then please consider retaining the AR provision with the simple single change of the word "the summary" to "a summary," which comports with the kind of "a" summary that is screen printed below, from then-Dean DiPaola's own summative review.

Also add this to the concerns ... the college faculties are now removed from status under AR 3:16 to receive copy of their dean review summary. Again, no chance for Senate or SC to discuss this change to AR.

