

# Five-Year Review Process for Senior Academic Officers

---

## Overview

The performance of senior academic officers (Provosts, Deans, Center and Institute Directors) at Tulane shall be subject to recurrent, formal, and comprehensive review at times that normally do not exceed five years.

The purpose of the performance review is to evaluate how well a colleague is fulfilling their leadership responsibilities, to note and extol successes, and to provide constructive recommendations for improvement. An academic dean/administrator whose appointment is being considered for continuation shall normally be reviewed at the beginning of the last year of his or her current appointment, but no later than the beginning of the fifth year of the appointment to their post. A decision about whether the appointment will be continued will be formally considered upon the completion of the review.

## The Review Committee

The Provost or President shall have primary responsibility for selecting an internal review committee, identifying its Chair, delivering the formal charge to the committee, and establishing a timeline for the review. Committee membership should include representation within and outside the relevant unit and should encompass representatives from the main fields and constituencies within the unit (faculty, students, staff, directors). The committee membership should also reflect, to whatever extent possible, the diversity goals of the university.

The committee is charged with evaluating the administrative performance of the colleague under review. The committee should establish specific evaluative criteria in light of the nature of the unit and the specific responsibilities and duties of the leader of that unit. It should identify the key accomplishments and strengths of the senior officer under review. In addition, the committee should identify any relevant problems at the administrative level under review; should evaluate the particular situation that faced the colleague at the beginning of his or her appointment, the current situation, and the future prospects of the unit; and should consider the administrative style of the colleague under review.

## Process

The review process will involve the preparation of a written self-evaluation from the Provost, Dean, or Director at the start of the evaluation. The report should provide the colleague's perspective on his or her accomplishments and goals, as well as opportunities and challenges for the coming five year period. The report may also be used to raise any particular issues that the Provost, Dean, or Director and/or the Provost or President would like to explore during the review.

It is recommended that the Provost, Dean, or Director be invited to meet with the Review Committee at one of the committee's initial meetings.

The chair of the committee may meet individually with the Provost, Dean, or Director at the beginning of the evaluation to gain perspective on the review and to identify specific areas in which evaluation information would be most useful.

## Guidelines for the Review

The following areas are suggested as a helpful guide for considering senior administrative performance and effectiveness.

### 1. Leadership

- Demonstrating a strong commitment to advancing the excellence of the unit.
- Developing goals and strategic plans and ensuring their implementation.
- Appointing and reviewing all direct reports.
- Making difficult decisions necessary to assure that goals are accomplished.
- Developing and implementing procedures for the smooth operation of the unit.

### 2. Campus Citizenship

- Taking a university perspective, helping to meet university goals, contributing to the activities of the university.
- Complying with university policies on, for example, teaching, research, advising, academic freedom, diversity, and academic integrity.

### 3. Human Resource Management

- Working effectively with other administrators, faculty, students, and staff within the unit.
- Serving as a positive role model for the unit.
- Supporting the professional development of members of the unit.

### 4. Communications

- Communicating information and decisions to members of the unit.
- Communicating with other internal and external constituencies.
- Fostering effective shared governance.

### 5. Responding to Work Demands

- Expending the effort to get the job done.
- Completing tasks in a timely manner.
- Responding appropriately to demands from above and below in the organization.
- Responding appropriately to changes or crises.

### 6. Budgeting and Use of Resources

- Making budget decisions consistent with the unit's goals.
- Making effective use of resources.
- Maintaining fiscal responsibility and developing strategies for promoting greater efficiency.
- Working with other parts of the university to design budget-sharing strategies.

### 7. Functioning of the Administrative Unit

- Appointing top-quality assistant and associate administrators and other support staff.
- Ensuring that the various functions of the office are serving well the faculty, staff, students, and other constituents served by the unit.

### 8. Fundraising

- Effectively and consistently developing external resources: gifts, grants, sponsored projects, and annual funds.

## Reports Summarizing the Review

The committee reports its findings to the Provost or, as appropriate, the President through a written summary. Two versions of the written report are generally required: (a) a full evaluation report, from the committee to the Provost or President, and (b) a brief evaluation report, designed for the Provost or President to share with the Provost, Dean, or Director being evaluated. Both reports should be signed by all members of the Review Committee. The Chair of the committee should confer with the Provost or the President as the written reports are developed. Templates for the Full Evaluation Report and the Brief Evaluation Report are provided, below:

### **Full Evaluation Report (to Provost or President)**

- Overview – summarizes key findings of the review
- Review Process – outlines the activities of the committee (e.g., meetings, dates, and key actions) and sources of data in the review (e.g., survey, open meetings of the faculty, individual meetings with key individuals)
- Interpretation of Data and Key Findings - summarizes themes that emerged in the evaluation data and process
- Opportunities and Challenges – highlights key issues and opportunities for the unit over the next five-year period
- Summary – overall assessment and impression of the evaluation committee
- Appendices – actual survey instrument and results, open-ended comments, other materials

### **Brief Evaluation Report (to Provost or President and to be shared with Provost, Dean, or Director)**

- Overview – outlines the major activities of the review
- Interpretation of Data and Key Findings – briefly highlights the major themes that emerged in the evaluation data
- Opportunities and Challenges – highlights key issues and opportunities for the unit over the next five-year period
- Summary – summarizes key points of review

### **General Timeline for the Five-Year Review Process**

- April – July: Provost or President meets with Provost, Dean, or Director to schedule the review for the upcoming academic year.
- August – September: The Provost or President identifies a Chair for the review committee and begins to invite colleagues to serve as members of the committee.
- October: Provost or President meets with Provost, Dean, or Director to discuss review. After the meeting, the Provost or President formally forms and charges the committee.
- October-December: Committee gathers and synthesizes information for the review.
- December-January: Committee finalizes review and prepares written reports.
- February: Committee conveys written reports to the Provost or President.
- March: Within a few weeks after the submission of the reports, the Provost or President meets with the Provost, Dean, or Director and communicates the review findings.
- March-April: The Provost or President completes the process and communicates with the colleague under review.