

I. OVERVIEW

To ensure excellence in leadership, familiarity with the range of faculty expectations, and governance of the board, the Dean of Faculty will be periodically reviewed through thorough research, reflection, and discussion. This review will ideally take place in the penultimate year of the dean's current contract; however, it may take place in the final year of the contract, as needed. The review will be conducted by an appointed committee of faculty and staff; however, feedback from the larger body of faculty and administration will be solicited. The committee will also consider a statement from the dean. The committee works closely with the provost, to whom they report and make a final, written recommendation.

Informed by the findings of the review committee, the provost will make a recommendation to the President of the School and the Board of Governors advocating to either continue or not extend the dean's term. Continuation is conferred by way of an additional contract; non-extension initiates a search or the appointment of an interim dean. The committee's recommendation may also lobby for a specific duration or provisos in the new contract, but the offering of a contract as well as its particulars are ultimately the province of the board and its chair. If offered, the dean may decline an additional contract in the Dean of Faculty role and return to a tenured faculty position; moreover, the dean's status as tenured faculty cannot be revoked as the result of a poor review or a non-continuation of contract, as long as they were not terminated with cause while dean.

The following document outlines the procedure that should be followed during the review process, including the personnel involved, criteria on which the dean is reviewed, a list of documentation that will accumulate over the course of the review, and a timeline. Additional questions regarding this process can be referred to the Office of the Provost.

II. PERSONNEL

The following individuals and groups have an active role, which is outlined below, in the review of the Dean of Faculty:

- Board of Governors—Like the president and provost, the Dean of Faculty serves at the pleasure of the governors. Final decisions on contract renewal are the province of the board, which considers the recommendation of the president and provost that is informed by the findings of the review committee in a process similar to tenure review.
- Dean of Faculty—The individual under review will provide the committee with a written statement that illuminates aspects of the practice and vision of the School and addresses the standard and, if applicable, additional review criteria (detailed in section III). During the review, the dean will also have an interview with the committee.
- Dean's Staff—To include the opinions of the dean's staff, the divisional deans will discuss the dean's performance with the associate deans, division chairs, and faculty services personnel through a regular departmental meeting or through another means of their choosing. Outcomes of this evaluation will be documented and shared with the committee.
- Department Heads, academic—To include a wide survey of faculty opinions in the review, academic department heads will discuss the dean's performance with the faculty of their departments through a regular departmental meeting or through another means of their

choosing. Outcomes of this evaluation will be documented and shared with the committee.

- Faculty Business Senate—The senate contributes to the review process by recommending a slate of no less than 12 faculty members who would be willing to sit on the committee. Exactly 1/3 of these faculty members should be adjunct, and the balance should be tenured full-time faculty. From this slate, the provost selects four full-time and two adjunct faculty to sit on the committee, in addition to the two full-time faculty and three administrators that the provost appoints directly. The senate may also exercise its prerogative to suggest one additional criterion for the committee to consider when evaluating the dean. The senate will also evaluate, in a fashion of their choosing, the dean's performance during the course of its regular work. Outcomes of this evaluation will be documented and shared with the committee.
- President—The president receives the recommendation of the provost regarding the future of the deanship and works with the provost to make a final recommendation to the board.
- Provost—As the supervisor of the dean, the review committee reports to the provost. The provost appoints eight faculty members overall: six from a slate proposed by the Faculty Business Senate, two of whom are adjuncts while the rest are tenured full-timers, as well as two full-time faculty chosen from across the entire School. Additionally, the provost appoints three administrators, making the review committee an 11-person group. The provost will meet with the review committee before their work begins and, after receiving their final recommendation, report back to the committee in writing, summarizing the final recommendation to the president and board. In addition to the findings of the committee, the provost may solicit and consider input from the other vice presidents of the School to garner an administrative peer opinion of the dean.
- Provost's Assistant—Administrative support to the review committee as well as the provost can be found in the Assistant to the Provost
- Review Committee—The Review Committee will comprise an 11-member body whose quorum will be seven. The Faculty Business Senate will put forward a list of names of tenured full-time and adjunct faculty. The proposed slate of faculty must include at least 12 potential committee members willing to serve, exactly 1/3 of whom are adjuncts. From that list, the provost will select four full-time faculty members and two adjunct members. Serving adjuncts will be paid for their service. The provost will also appoint two other faculty members from across the entire School and three administrators.

All committee members must attend the initial meeting with the provost and the interview with the dean. It is expected that a quorum will be present at all other meetings. The exact number and agenda of their internal meetings are held at the committee's discretion.

The committee will elect one of their members to serve as the chair. The chair will be the point-person for the Office of the Provost, as the Assistant to the Provost is the contact for the committee. The chair will be responsible for keeping track of the committee's final document, as well as any necessary minutes, although the production of these texts may be delegated or shared among the committee members.

At the end of their review, the committee writes a final document to the provost that is similar to a Faculty Contract and Tenure Review Board letter. At a minimum, this letter summarizes the strengths and areas for improvement of the dean, using evidence from the review documents (outlined in section IV) and their conversations, and enumerates votes for and against re-upping the dean's contract. Each committee member gets one vote for or against. Abstentions are not permitted. The committee is also encouraged to expound upon the overall direction of the School and advise the provost on how they see the dean's role in the future.

Once their review is complete, the provost is obligated to respond to committee's findings in writing. The provost's response includes an evaluation of the dean and outlines a recommendation to the president and board. Upon receiving the review letters from the dean and provost, the dean may also request a single, post-review follow-up meeting with the committee, for which at least a quorum of members must be present. The purpose of such a follow-up would be to ensure the successful progress of the School through further dialogue about the findings of the review.

III. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

The following five standard criteria will be used in the dean's review. These criteria should be addressed in all written documents associated with the review (detailed in section IV). Each criterion can be framed with a question, included below. The dean and committee may consider the suggested possible evidence associated with each criterion; however, these are neither a mandatory nor exhaustive strategy to exhibiting proficiency in each area. The senate may augment these review areas with one additional criterion, provided they comport with the outline in section III.B; therefore, there will be a minimum of five and a maximum of six criteria for each review:

A. Standard Criteria

1) Academic mission and leadership

a) Framing question

- *What has the dean done to forward the academic mission of SAIC?*

b) Possible evidence

- Curriculum innovation
- Interdisciplinarity
- Intersection of art and design
- Promoting scholarship and teaching
- Furthering academic programs
- Works toward creating parity among academic departments

2) Personnel and leadership

a) Framing question

- *What has the dean done to hire, mentor, and promote faculty and academic staff?*

b) Possible evidence

- Position allocations
- Searches
- Reviews
- Work with department and program chairs
- Academic promotion and awards

- Attention to part-time faculty issues
 - Attention to diversity, broadly considered
- 3) Budget, finance, and leadership
- a) Framing question
 - *What has the dean done to manage academic budgets and support?*
 - b) Possible evidence
 - Faculty and staff salaries
 - Department budgets
 - Research budgets
 - Academic equipment and support
- 4) Communication/Vision/Innovation and leadership
- a) Framing question
 - *In the spirit of shared governance, how effectively has the dean led the faculty, helped to set appropriate academic priorities, and communicated and justified academic decisions?*
 - b) Possible evidence
 - Transparency in decision-making
 - Working with committees
 - Sustaining faculty and staff morale
- 5) Forethought, planning, and leadership
- a) Framing question
 - *Where is SAIC headed? Where is art, design headed? The world? What qualities does a dean need to have for the future?*
 - b) Possible evidence
 - Coherent vision of the School
 - Savvy sense of the contemporary art and design landscape
 - Groundwork laid for School's growth/improvement

B. Additional Criterion

If they elect to, the senate may require the dean to respond to one additional criterion of their choosing; however, that criterion must be something clearly germane to the job of dean that is either *not* covered in the previous criteria or *makes explicit* a particular aspect or incidence within the previous criteria. In the latter case, the dean may elect to respond to this criterion under the appropriate rubric; however, it should be made clear that all criteria are being addressed. Like standard criteria, additional criterion should be considered by all individuals and groups who have an active role in the review of the Dean.

IV. DOCUMENTATION

The following documents, outlined below, will be produced and collected during the review process:

- Dean's Document to the Committee—This document is a written statement, no more than ten pages in length (five double-sided sheets), that shows how each of the five standard and, if applicable, additional criteria have been addressed. Although the primary audience for this document is the committee, the dean is encouraged to address the entire School

community in her report, as this document should be made available to any SAIC stakeholder.

- **Senate's Document to the Committee**—This document is a written reflection, no more than two pages in length (one double-sided sheet), on the dean's performance authored by the senate during their normal course of business in a manner of their choosing. The senate should use the five standard and, if applicable, additional criteria in their reflection. The only audience for this document is the committee, the provost, and the senate.
- **Academic Department Head's Documents to the Committee**—These documents are written reflections, each no more than two pages in length (one double-sided sheet), on the dean's performance authored by each of the department heads that encapsulate the range of opinions among their faculty. The faculty's voice may be captured during a departmental meeting or in another fashion of the head's choosing. (Additionally, individual faculty may author their own reflections and submit them to the committee directly.) The departments should use the five standard and, if applicable, additional criteria in their reflection. The only audience for these documents is the committee, the provost, and the department (or individual faculty member).
- **Dean's Staff's Document to the Committee**—This document is a written reflection, no more than two pages in length (one double-sided sheet), on the dean's performance authored by the divisional deans that encapsulates the range of opinions among the dean's staff, including the divisional deans, associate deans, division chairs, and faculty services personnel. The staff's voice may be captured during a departmental meeting or in another fashion of the divisional deans' choosing. The dean's staff should use the five standard and, if applicable, additional criteria in their reflection. The only audience for these documents is the committee, the provost, and the dean's staff.
- **Committee's Document to the Provost**—This document is a written summary, no more than six pages in length (three double-sided sheets), of the committee's findings on the dean's performance as well as a tally of votes for continuation of the dean's contract. The committee must evaluate how successfully the dean addresses each of the five standard and, if applicable, additional criteria in their summary. An anonymous vote tally to retain the current dean (aye) or to not renew the current dean's contract (nay) must be included in the document. Abstentions are unacceptable; a total of 11 aye and/or nay votes must be recorded. This document is addressed to the provost, who will forward a copy to the dean. Other stakeholders that the provost deems appropriate may also review this document.
- **Provost's Document to the Committee**—This document is a written response, no more than two pages in length (one double-sided sheet), to the committee's summary of the dean's performance. This response must outline the recommendation the provost will make to the president and board and include an assessment of the dean, addressing the standard and, if applicable, additional criteria. This document is addressed to the committee, and it will also be shared with the dean. Other stakeholders that the provost deems appropriate may also review this document.

V. TIMELINE

The ideal timeline for the review of the dean is outlined below. Specific target dates may be set by the provost and the committee for each review:

- September:
 - Senate suggests additional review criteria, if desired

- October:
 - Committee appointed by senate and provost
 - Provost meets with committee
 - Dean submits document to committee and provost no later than October 31

- November:
 - Dean's document is made available to all SAIC stakeholders
 - Senate, dean's staff, and departments solicited for input
 - Committee conducts interview with dean before Thanksgiving

- December:
 - Senate, dean's staff, and departments submit documents to committee no later than the end of the fall semester

- February:
 - Committee deliberates
 - Committee makes written recommendation to provost
 - Dean may request a follow-up meeting with committee, if desired; the follow-up meeting must take place before the end of the spring semester

- March:
 - Provost responds to committee's recommendation in writing and makes recommendation to the president and board
 - Board votes to renew dean's contract or appoints a new dean (or interim dean) at their next meeting