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This document outlines the procedures governing the review of Deans and Vice Chancellors.

To assure every individual participating in a five-year review of its significance and the importance of maintaining confidentiality, the administrative oversight of the process should rest with a senior position in the Chancellor’s Organization, such as the Assistant Provost. Interactions with advisory committee members and other review participants should be conducted with great sensitivity, along the lines of the care given to the executive search process.

1. The UC Academic Personnel Manual states: “The Chancellor shall conduct a five-year review for each Dean to determine whether reappointment to another term is warranted. In each case involving the review of a Dean, the Chancellor, after consultation with the Academic Senate, shall appoint an advisory committee to review the Dean’s performance and accomplishments. The advisory committee shall report its findings to the Chancellor.” Thus, the APM wording gives considerable latitude in the application of the policy. It has been the custom at UCLA that such a review is only conducted when there is interest, both on the part of the academic Dean or Vice Chancellor, and the Chancellor, that the term of service be considered for an additional term.

2. The review process should begin with a meeting - between the individual being reviewed and the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and/or the Chancellor - to discuss the upcoming review. The format for the pending review should be discussed and the desire of all parties to proceed with the review confirmed. The Dean or Vice Chancellor should be asked to a) suggest individuals to serve on the advisory review committee and b) identify individuals who they believe will have a conflict of interest. The Dean or Vice Chancellor should also be asked to suggest potential reviewers, both to receive solicitation letters and to be interviewed by the advisory committee. Identifying an individual with a possible conflict of interest would not absolutely preclude that individual from serving on the committee.

3. The Chancellor and EVC/Provost should consult with the Academic Senate leadership prior to selecting the members of the advisory review committee. It is anticipated that the Academic Senate leadership will utilize existing entities within the organization to respond to this request, including the Committee on Committees and, in the case of Deans, the unit’s FEC. The chair of the committee for a Dean or Academic Vice Chancellor should have senior academic executive experience but need not be a peer (i.e. a current Dean or Vice Chancellor). The membership of the committees for academic deans should, in most instances, include a standing academic Dean and/or Vice Chancellor. The advisory committee should be constituted with consideration given to demonstrated trustworthiness and competence, evaluation experience and skill.

4. A short briefing and charging memo should be prepared and presented by the EVC/Provost to the advisory committee when he/she charges the group:
a) The advisory committee should be asked to complete their deliberations and present their report within three months.

b) The EVC/Provost should convey the necessity that all of the committee’s deliberations remain strictly confidential.

c) In addition to soliciting letters (for Deans, from the Regular “senate” faculty who hold appointments in the area(s) overseen by the Dean as well as from others in the senior leadership, such as Deans and Vice Chancellors), the committee should be charged to determine the most effective means to assess how different constituents of the Dean or Vice Chancellor’s unit evaluate his or her performance.

d) The advisory committee should have access to documents pertinent to the review including: 1) a self-evaluation composed by the Dean or Vice Chancellor; ii) the unit’s most recent strategic plan and departmental reviews (public documents); iii) other items submitted by the Dean or Vice Chancellor.

e) The committee’s deliberations must focus on identifying both the individual's strengths and possible areas that need further attention.

f) The Academic Personnel Manual states: “a Dean’s overall performance should be judged as distinguished or highly meritorious in order to be reappointed.” The EVC/Provost should make clear that the committee is being asked to provide a reasoned overview of the Dean or Vice Chancellor’s performance to contribute to the Chancellor’s knowledge in making a final evaluation

g) A copy of these procedures should be given to each member of the advisory committee.

5. The individual under review should be invited to meet with the advisory committee at the beginning of their deliberations, prior to conducting other interviews. At this meeting, the individual’s self-statement should be discussed.

6. The primary challenge before the advisory committee is to obtain the input necessary to obtain an accurate and broad understanding of the Dean or Vice Chancellor’s activities and performance in these activities. The advisory committee’s first task should be to assess the expertise available within the group itself, identify where expertise is lacking and the most effective means to gather data to aid the committee’s deliberations. The committee should have two primary means by which to obtain input:

   a) Interviews should be conducted with non-committee members. Notes should be taken of these interviews but not minutes. These notes are taken with the sole purpose of assisting the chair of the advisory group in summarizing the deliberations of the committee and will, therefore, be destroyed after the written report is composed.
b) Solicitation letters should be sent to all Regular faculty who fall within the areas under a Dean’s purview. Additionally, and in the case of Vice Chancellors, letters should be solicited from the Deans and Vice Chancellors. Letters may be requested from those individuals for whom an interview is not necessary or practical. A standard solicitation letter for reviews of Deans and Vice Chancellors should be used, with modifications as required made by the committee to make the document applicable to the specific Dean or Vice Chancellor. Letters received should not be made available to the Dean or Vice Chancellor. The Council on Academic Personnel should also be invited to provide a written comment regarding the Dean or Vice Chancellor.

7. The advisory committee should seek a balance amongst individuals to interview and/or solicit letters. Due to the seniority of the individual under review, it is understood that the majority of opinions available will be from subordinates or relevant faculty; but the committee should also seek out input from peers and knowledgeable leaders, even when these individuals may be external to UCLA and UC.

8. The advisory committee should draft a report of its findings at the conclusion of their deliberations. To ensure confidentiality is maintained, the draft report should be reviewed by the Assistant Provost’s Office. Once accepted, the draft report should be sent to the Dean or Vice Chancellor with an invitation to meet, for a second time, with the advisory committee should they so wish. The report should not be finalized until this invitation has been extended and, if requested, the meeting with the individual occurs.

9. The review should conclude with a final meeting attended by the EVC/Provost and/or the Chancellor and the advisory committee. At this meeting the committee should present its findings and submit its final report. The committee should then be disbanded.

10. The Chancellor and EVC/Provost should meet with the individual under consideration and share the insights of the review, presenting the individual with the advisory committee’s final report.

11. Following this meeting and supporting current practice, the final written report of the committee can be made available for 30 days to Ladder faculty who wish to review it.

12. If the candidate of the five-year review writes a response to the draft report, the response should be considered as a codicil to the main report, and should be available to the Chancellor, EVC/Provost, and Ladder faculty along with the final report.

Updated for clarification January 2010.
Sabbatical leave credits do not accrue during transition leave periods. Sabbatical leave credit accrual resumes upon return to University faculty service.

(4) The combined total of transition leave and sabbatical leave taken during administrative service within the last five years may not exceed one year (12 months).

240-80 **Review Procedures for Decanal Duties**

This section of policy formalizes review procedures for the administrative portion of a Dean’s duties. The administrative review procedures are separate and distinct from the formal academic review procedures governing the underlying faculty appointment as described in APM - 210, Review and Appraisal Committees, and APM - 220, Professor Series.

a. **Annual Assessment**

The Chancellor shall conduct an annual assessment for each Dean. The Chancellor shall communicate the key components of the assessment to each Dean.

b. **Five-Year Review and Reappointment**

(1) The Chancellor shall conduct a five-year review for each Dean to determine whether reappointment to another term is warranted. In each case involving the five-year review of a Dean, the Chancellor, after consultation with the Academic Senate, shall appoint an advisory committee to review the Dean’s performance and accomplishments. The advisory committee shall report its findings to the Chancellor.

(2) The Chancellor shall develop the criteria and procedures for conducting five-year Dean reviews.

(3) A Dean’s overall performance should be judged as distinguished or highly meritorious in order to be reappointed.