



University Senate
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee
Response to Charge S-2103: Review of the Current Procedures for the Periodic Evaluation of Deans

A. Charge

Charge Number S-2103
Title Review of the Current Procedures for the Periodic Evaluation of Deans
Description *At least one recent decanal review revealed some shortcomings in the process itself. For example, there is need for better defined timelines. Once the Dean's Evaluation Committee sends its report to the Dean for comment, there is no set time for the Dean to respond. Need to define the timing of the process and possible means to terminate a dean.*

B. Consultants to this Charge Report

Gloria Bachmann, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Faculty
Dewanna Graham, Alumni Association
Oscar Holmes IV, Camden At-Large, Faculty

C. Background

This charge was referred to the FPAC with an initial due date of February 2022. It is unclear if this charge was assigned to a subcommittee, but there are no records of any report being submitted regarding the charge. On January 20, 2023, a new subcommittee was established to review this charge. FPAC Co-Chair Anna Haley asked the Executive Committee for a deadline extension and the charge was reissued with a new due date of November 22, 2023. Little information regarding the impetus of this charge was provided. An FPAC subcommittee was created that included Gloria Bachmann, Dewanna Graham, Oscar, Holmes IV, Yahong Zhang, and Steven Malin to review the charge. The subcommittee requested Dean Evaluation information from the Human Resources Department and current deans. They were provided with a document that outlined the Evaluation Procedure for Deans.

D. Discussion

A subcommittee meeting was held on March 6, 2023 to discuss the charge and evaluation document. Additional information provided by Kim C. O'Halloran, Vice President for Academic Planning and Administration and Chief of Staff, confirmed that the Dean Evaluation document was the university's approved Dean evaluation process that is used across the university and linked [here](#). Our review found that the process for the evaluation of academic deans was clear, and in fact, a timeline for the Dean to respond was well-defined. On page 4, #11, it is stated that "Once completed, the report of the DEC shall be sent to the dean, along with a request for a written response within a 30-day timeframe. The DEC will have access to the dean's response and may choose to modify the original evaluation report in response to the dean's reply, particularly in cases where the dean has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation." Point #13 states, "Within 30 days of the release of the non-confidential summary to the faculty, the chancellor or chancellor-provost should meet with the dean to discuss the evaluation." Finally, Point #14 states, "Also, within 30 days of the release of the non-confidential summary to the faculty, the chancellor or chancellor-provost should then meet together with the dean and the unit faculty to discuss those results of the evaluation that pertain to unit policy, its strategic direction and its mode of operation and plans (if any) to bring about policy changes stemming from the review process.

Based on the information above that speaks directly to the charge, **the subcommittee recommends that this information is shared with the FPAC committee and reported out to the broader Senate community in order to close this charge.**