

Review Procedures for Administrators

ACA-10

About This Policy

Effective Dates:

03-28-1978

Last Updated:

04-13-1993

Responsible University Administrator:

University Faculty Council

Policy Contact:

ufcoff@indiana.edu

Scope

The Review shall apply to those officers/offices reporting directly to the President and Executive Vice Presidents of Indiana University

Policy Statement

Administrative officers holding positions that bear directly on the system-wide teaching/research mission of the university shall have their performance and the performance of their office evaluated regularly by a process referred to as Review.

Procedure

1. The Review shall be conducted early in the fifth year in office and in recurring intervals of five years thereafter.
2. At the last meeting of each year of the University Faculty Council, the President shall announce the list of all those officers who will be subject to Review the following year as well as the respective appointing officer(s). When an administrator's duration of service necessitates Review, the official to whom that administrator most directly reports shall be the appointing officer of a Review Committee selected according to the following provisions:
 - a. Because the positions to be reviewed bear directly on the teaching and research mission of the university, a majority of the members of the Review Committee shall be from the faculty.
 - b. In reviewing a chief administrative officer for a particular campus, a majority of members of the Review Committee shall be chosen by the appointing officer from a list of faculty on that campus recommended by an appropriate faculty body.
 - c. The number of faculty recommended from among the Bloomington, Indianapolis, and regional campuses shall be in rough proportion to the degree these campuses fall under the jurisdiction of the administrative position being reviewed.
 - d. The University Faculty Council's Nomination Committee shall be charged with submitting a list of prospective Review Committee members for approval by the University Faculty Council for submission to the appointing officer. The list should contain roughly one-third more names than the total to be selected by the appointing officer, so as to provide the appointing officer some choice in appointing faculty to the committee.

- e. In addition to receiving nominations for the Review Committee from the University Faculty Council, the appointing officer should solicit nominations from representative student bodies as well as other constituencies, as appropriate.
 - f. The appointing officer shall appoint the Review Committee Chair.
3. Appointing officers shall make their requests for the creation of Review Committees in such a manner that at least one semester is available for completion of the Review process.
 4. The appointing officer and the Secretary/Co-Secretaries of the University Faculty Council shall convene the Review Committees. The appointing officer shall cooperate with the Review Committee to assure that the administrator under Review meets reasonable requests by the Review Committee for information. The appointing officer shall provide the Review Committee with a description of the duties and responsibilities of the administrator under Review and any existing reports of previous reviews as well as arrange for reasonable and adequate staff and financial support for the activities of the Review Committee. The administrator under review shall provide the Committee with a statement of his or her administrative goals and objectives. The Review Committee shall be free to establish its own procedures, provided that it consults with all university constituencies affected by the administrator under review and responds with data to the following questions as a minimum:
 - a. Has the administrator set clear goals and objectives for the unit? Are these appropriate for the unit?
 - b. To what extent does the administrator facilitate the achievement of these goals?
 - c. How effectively does the administrator represent the unit to persons outside the unit?
 - d. How successful has the administrator been in managing the unit in the face of pressures?
 - e. How is the unit perceived on a campus, system, state, and national level?
 - f. How effectively has the administrator implemented the University's policies, including the Affirmative Action Plan?

In reviewing academic administrators, the Review Committee shall consult faculty in faculty-governance positions as well as a representative sample of the appropriate faculty body.

5. Prior to submitting a final report to the appointing officer, the Review Committee should meet separately with the official being reviewed and then with the appointing officer to discuss the findings of the report. The Review Committee then shall make the report in writing to the appointing officer. The appointing officer shall respond to the Review Committee, discussing actions to be taken as a result of the Committee's findings and recommendations. The appointing officer is encouraged to provide the official reviewed with a copy. The report shall consist of a narrative and critique, a summary of the committee's findings, and recommendations. After the review is complete and the final report has been written, a copy of this report should be sent confidentially to the UFC Agenda Committee. This will usually be the same report sent to the President. On rare occasions a committee might send an abridged report to the Agenda Committee. The chairperson of the Review Committee should of course feel free to consult with the co chairs of the UFC as he/she prepares the report. After receiving the report, the UFC Agenda Committee will invite the Review Committee chairperson to present an oral summary report to the UFC in Executive Session as required by Academic Handbook procedures.
6. The Trustees of Indiana University are urged to accept regular review as desirable for the offices of President and Treasurer and to acknowledge that consultation with faculty, staff, and students of the University as well as other University constituencies is an important part of these Reviews. Furthermore, the Trustees are urged to take advantage of the process outlined herein for the creation of faculty membership of a Review Committee for these offices. In these cases, the President of the Board of Trustees would act as the appointing officer and the recipient of the Review Committee's report.

7. The University Faculty Council recommends that local campus faculty councils/bodies consider promulgating procedures for the review of their campus-wide administrative offices/officers.
8. At the time the final report is sent to the President, a copy of this same report should be sent confidentially to the Agenda Committee/Executive Committee of the faculty council/body of the campus of the chancellor/provost being reviewed. That Agenda Committee/Executive Committee will decide how the summary of the report is to be made available to their faculty. As recommendations contained in the review of the chancellor/provost are implemented, the chancellor/provost should report them to the Agenda Committee/ Executive Committee of the local campus faculty council/body which should report them to the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee.

History

University Faculty Council, March 28, 1978; March 26, 1985; April 13, 1993