

Guidelines for Review of Academic Administrators Department Chair

I. Introduction

The purpose of these Guidelines is to provide assistance to UTHealth Deans and their appointed Evaluation Committees when conducting evaluations of Academic Administrators and to ensure consistency among the Schools in the application of HOOP 184.

Overview and Purpose

The main purpose of the review of department chairs is to evaluate the chair's effectiveness in promoting the department's missions of education, research, service, and clinical care (if applicable) in a manner that models university and professional values. Because departments vary in size, scope, resources, goals and responsibilities the Evaluation Committee, in conducting the review, determines the degree to which specific issues are addressed and evaluated and the information that is considered in a given review. General features of the review should include the following:

1. The review should be conducted in light of the chair's position description, specific charges and assignments from his/her supervisor, the internal and external environments, and resources available to the chair. The review shall include a self- evaluation by the chair.
2. The review should focus on the chair's overall performance and major issues over the time course of the review rather than on infrequent, isolated matters. The review should consider primarily the chair's administrative performance rather than his/her academic work.
3. The review should consider demonstrated progress in meeting assignments, goals, and identified performance improvement goals specified in annual reviews during the six-year period.
4. The review shall be comprehensive and include input from department faculty members to the Evaluation Committee.
5. The chair shall have the opportunity to:
 - a. review a draft of the report and comment to the Evaluation Committee before a final report is submitted to the Dean; and
 - b. review the final report and have the option to submit his/her written comments or response to the Dean.
6. The review should focus on the six year evaluation period rather than the total length of the chair's appointment.

II. Process

A. Appointment of the Evaluation Committee

The Dean will annually appoint six members from the school to an Evaluation Committee as specified in HOOP Policy 184 – *Evaluation of Academic Administrators*. Faculty members of any academic rank at assistant professor or above, any track, and any tenure status may be appointed. The Dean will appoint a Chair or Co-Chairs from among the six members of the Evaluation Committee.

B. Information to be Considered by the Evaluation Committee in Developing its Report

1. The chair's statement of the department or unit's status at the beginning and over the six-year period of the review period and the chair's self-evaluation. (To be provided by the chair and forwarded through the Dean's Office, with the option for the Dean to comment, to the Evaluation Committee).
2. The chair's CV and personal statement of his/her individual contributions to the teaching, research, service programs, and clinical activities (if appropriate) of the department, school, discipline and profession (to be provided by the chair).
3. The job description of the chair's position, any performance expectations or assignments from the Dean or other supervisor over the period of the review, and all available annual evaluations of the chair. Particular attention should be paid to the chair's achievements of goals and in areas recommended for improvement in annual evaluations and other relevant communications. (To be provided by the Dean's Office or chair as determined by the Dean of each school).
4. Input from departmental faculty members and departmental administrative staff and, as the Evaluation Committee feels appropriate, from students/trainees and other individuals in the school and/or university. Each Dean shall determine the most appropriate mechanism to obtain faculty input.
5. The following criteria should be considered in the evaluation of the chair's performance:
 - a. Progress in achieving the department goals in education, research, service, and clinical activities (as appropriate);
 - b. Support of the school and institutional mission and goals;
 - c. Faculty and/or trainee recruitment, development, mentoring, and retention;
 - d. Leadership and management;
 - e. Promotion of and support for diversity among faculty, staff, and students;
 - f. Stewardship of resources;
 - g. Communication with faculty, staff, and trainees;
 - h. Promotion of and support for a collegial and professional environment;
 - i. Promotion and demonstration of university values; and
 - j. Enhancement of the school's/department's local, state, and national reputation.

If, after the review of the above materials, the Evaluation Committee needs additional information to conduct the evaluation, the Committee Chair will discuss the Evaluation Committee's reason(s) for requesting the desired information with the Dean, who will then decide whether it is appropriate and feasible to consider the requested information in the review and if so, how to obtain it. To avoid duplication of effort in collecting and analyzing material, the Dean and Evaluation Committee should use existing information whenever possible..

The Evaluation Committee may elect to interview the chair or other individuals, e.g., faculty, staff, or trainees of the department or school or other members of the university community.

The chair under review shall be provided a draft report from the Evaluation Committee for review and shall have 14 calendar days from receipt of the draft report to provide comments to the Evaluation Committee. The Committee may consider the chair's comments when preparing the final report.

The Committee will send the final report to the chair and the Dean. Within seven (7) days the chair has the option to (1) submit comments on the final report to the Dean and have them appended to the report; or, (2) inform the Dean that he/she does not wish to provide comments. Within 14-calendar days after being notified of the chair's choice, the Dean will forward the final report to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Development for the Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer (EVPCAO). The Dean has the option to provide his/her comments to the report as an appendix.

The EVPCAO will in turn forward the final report, with the chair's and/or Dean's comments appended if so requested, to the President and Vice-Chancellor for Health Affairs. The EVPCAO will be responsible for maintaining a copy of the report and any requested appendices.

C. Committee Report

The committee report should include the dates of the six-year period of the review, the names of the Evaluation Committee members and chair(s), and the following elements:

1. A summary of progress achieving the goals and major areas recommended for improvement in available annual reviews and any other assignments from the Dean;
2. Recommendations to improve the chair's administrative and leadership roles in the department to enhance achievement of its mission and goals in education, research, service and clinical activities (as appropriate), including any specific recommendations related to the criteria in Section B. 5 (a-j) above;
3. A description and summary evaluation of input from the department faculty;
4. A narrative summary of the Committee's review and assessment; and
5. An overall assessment of
 - a. Category One – Exceeds Expectations;
 - b. Category Two – Meets Expectations
 - c. Category Three – Does Not Meet Expectations; or
 - d. Category Four – Unsatisfactory.

The final report shall represent the majority opinion of the Evaluation Committee.

D. Review Process and Timeline

The review shall cover a six-year period and be performed in the year immediately following completion of the six year period being assessed. The fiscal year (9/1 – 8/31) that includes the effective date of the administrative appointment shall count as Year One (1) of the six year review period.

[EXAMPLE: A chair is initially appointed on any date within FY 2015. The first six-year evaluation would assess performance from FY 2015 through FY 2020 and would be performed in FY 2021. The second six-year evaluation would assess performance from FY 2021 through FY 2026 and would be performed during FY 2027.]

No later than July 1st of each year, the Dean shall notify each academic administrator to be reviewed in the coming academic year and shall appoint the school's Evaluation Committee. The Dean shall also notify by July 1st all relevant individuals and offices within the school and university that will provide materials to be used by the administrators under review and the Evaluation Committee.

By August 1st of each year the Dean shall provide a schedule for the coming academic year for the review process including timelines and due dates for:

1. submission of required materials from the department, school, and university offices to the administrators being reviewed and the Evaluation Committee;
2. submission of draft reports from the Evaluation Committee to the administrator under review for his/her comments; and
3. submission of final Evaluation Committee reports to the Dean and administrator.

The schedule should allow sufficient notice for the administrator, department, school, and university offices to collect required information and provide it to the administrator and Evaluation Committee.

The Dean is responsible for submitting all final reports performed in a given year, including any appendices as requested, to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Development for the EVPCAO by August 31st of the year in which the reviews are conducted.

The EVPCAO will forward copies of the report to the President and Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and will maintain a copy for the university records.

May 15, 2015: Adopted by the Office of Academic and Research Affairs

August 1, 2016: Amended responsible offices to Office of Faculty Affairs and Development and Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer (EVPCAO)