

**PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE OFFICERS**

**in**

**THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA**

**MAY 12, 2008**

**AMENDED TO REFLECT MOTIONS PASSED  
AT FACULTY MEETINGS HELD:**

The procedures described in this section pertain to reappointment of Department Executive Officer (DEO) in the College of Engineering.

- A. Purpose. A review of a DEO at the end of a term of appointment to:
  - 1. develop a meaningful basis for the decision about whether or not to reappoint a DEO,
  - 2. enhance administrative performance of the DEO,
  - 3. improve accountability of the DEO to appropriate constituencies, and
  - 4. help achieve greater communication across all levels of the university about program goals and their implementation.
  
- B. Timing: The review shall be conducted prior to the expiration of the appointment of the DEO and allowing adequate time for a substantive review.
  
- C. Responsibilities:
  - 1. The individual responsible for initiating the review is the Dean of the College of Engineering (hereinafter called the Dean).
  - 2. The DEO shall be responsible for preparing for the Dean and the review committee a self-assessment of his or her performance during the period under review. The self-assessment shall take into account recommendations of prior reviews if applicable, the goals and mission, and, if applicable, the most recent strategic plan of the DEO's Department (hereinafter called the Department). The DEO's self-assessment shall be delivered to the Dean before the review committee is appointed.
  - 3. The review committee shall work with the Dean to prepare an assessment tool (e.g., web survey) for the review.
  - 4. The review committee shall be responsible for gathering any additional information that it thinks necessary to prepare an assessment of the administrator's performance.
  
- D. Review Committee Membership. A review committee (hereinafter called the "committee") shall be organized to compile information and make recommendations to aid in the overall assessment of the DEO. The composition of the committee will be determined by the Dean. The size of the committee may vary, but, the majority of the members of the Committee shall be faculty members with their primary appointments in the Department and include, at a minimum, at least one faculty member from outside the Department and three faculty members from the Department. The Dean will ask the departmental faculty to nominate faculty and, if applicable, staff, to serve on the review committee. From the nominees, the Dean will select a representative review committee.
  
- E. Scope. The committee shall evaluate the DEO's performance within each of the following areas, taking into account the degree to which each area relates to the DEO's responsibilities. The committee should consult with the Dean in identifying those aspects of the following areas that are most pertinent to assessing the DEO's performance:
  - 1. Goal formation and attainment. Has the administrator taken a leadership role in formulating appropriate goals for the office or unit, reflecting awareness of

- educational and professional trends, and has he or she consulted with faculty of the Department in the process of doing so? If goals were agreed upon at the beginning of the period under review, to what degree have those goals been attained?
2. Scholarship. Does the DEO encourage scholarship among the faculty and does he or she create an environment that fosters and encourages scholarly pursuits? Does he or she recognize excellence in scholarship?
  3. Educational leadership. How well does the Department fulfill its educational mission? How effective is the DEO in stimulating discussion of new ideas about teaching and in encouraging and guiding promising developments through to implementation? Has the DEO helped to provide an environment within the Department and between the Department and other parts of the University that enhances the educational efforts of faculty and students? Does the DEO establish a congenial educational environment?
  4. Personnel management. Does the DEO show concern for and zeal in recruiting or encouraging the recruiting of the highest quality new appointments available? How well does the DEO do in choosing, evaluating, and supervising subordinates reporting directly to him or her? How well does the DEO's office perform in general?
  5. Resource management. Does the DEO seek to obtain resources that are adequate to enable the Department to achieve its full academic potential, and does he or she arrange for appropriate support services for the Department?
  6. Relationships among constituencies. Does the DEO establish and enhance good working relationships with faculty, staff, students, external constituencies, and those other administrators with whom the DEO regularly interacts?
  7. Planning and policy making. Does the DEO: 1) involve the faculty and other relevant constituencies in planning and policy making; 2) provide opportunities for consultation through individual and group meetings; and 3) provide information (with the exception of information to which access is restricted by other policies) in a timely, full, and open manner to facilitate effective participation in planning and policy making?
  8. Human rights and diversity. Does the DEO provide effective leadership in the implementation of University policies relating to human rights and diversity, including policies on affirmative action?
  9. Promoting constructive innovation. Does the DEO encourage constructive suggestions for new goals or programs, or new ways for accomplishing ongoing goals more effectively?
  10. Scope of leadership. Has the DEO demonstrated knowledge of developments and educational leadership beyond his or her Department, including campus wide leadership and leadership at the state or national level, as appropriate to his or her responsibilities?

F. Procedures.

1. The committee shall devise mechanisms for obtaining information and evaluations from relevant faculty, staff and students with regard to the relevant performance areas

identified in section (E.). The chair of the committee will consult with the Dean concerning the mechanisms to be used, and the identity of any other constituencies from which information or evaluative statements should be solicited.

2. In partial fulfillment of its duties under the preceding paragraph, the Committee shall collect, through a questionnaire, anonymous faculty evaluations of the administrator. The questions will be informed by the categories of administrative performance listed in section (E.) to the extent that they are relevant. The faculty questions will conform to the requirements of paragraphs (a.) and (b.) below, while the form and content of the questions directed at staff and students will be within the committee's discretion.
  - a. Faculty respondents will be instructed to circle their responses for a single category/ number on the following scale: *No Chance to Observe / 1 Strongly Disagree / 2 Disagree / 3 Agree / 4 Strongly Agree*. Each question will also provide an opportunity for a qualitative narrative response.
  - b. At a minimum, the faculty questionnaire shall ask respondents to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with the following five statements (the "core questions"):
    - i. The DEO has my trust and respect. [*1 / 2 / 3 / 4*]
    - ii. The DEO does a good job in discharging the teaching mission of the unit. [*No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4*]
    - iii. The DEO does a good job in promoting the quantity and quality of faculty scholarship. [*No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4*]
    - iv. Overall, the DEO is effective. [*No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4*]
    - v. The DEO should be re-appointed for another term. [*Yes / No*]

#### G. Review Report.

1. Preparation. The Committee is responsible for assembling the information obtained from faculty, staff and students; listing strengths and weaknesses of the DEO and formulating conclusions. It shall compile a preliminary report containing this information and the conclusions, which shall be confidential.
2. Opportunity for Response. Upon completing its report, the committee shall transmit the report to the Dean who shall provide the DEO with a complete copy and permit the DEO to prepare a written response within 30 days.
3. After receiving the DEO's response, if any, the Committee will finalize the report within two weeks.
4. Informing faculty. After receiving the final report assembled under this section and in consultation with the review committee, the Dean shall transmit the substance of the committee's evaluation to the constituent faculty. Transmission to the faculty shall be within two weeks of the receipt of the committee's report. In transmitting the results of the faculty questionnaire, the Dean shall report the response rate (the number and the proportion of the constituent faculty completing the questionnaire) and the aggregate responses (mean, standard deviation, median and specific distribution) to

each question posed to the faculty in the questionnaire, subject to the following limitations:

- a. If the Dean decides not to reappoint the DEO, or the DEO elects not to seek reappointment, it will be solely within the Dean's discretion which of the aggregate responses, if any, are reported to the faculty.
  - b. Responses to the five core questions as defined in paragraph (F.2.b.) above must be reported to the constituent faculty. The Dean has discretion to share or not share the specific responses to the other questions provided the Dean gives the faculty a summary of the strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation.
  - c. In every case, the Dean shall consult with the review committee concerning the transmission of the substance of the review committee's report to appropriate constituencies other than faculty, such as students and staff.
- H. Decision on reappointment of the DEO. In the event the dean's recommendation differs from the majority of the answers to question (v.) of section (F.2.b.) the dean shall report the reasons to the Department faculty and the Provost and the Executive Vice President of the University.