

Academic Senate Report on the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees”, 2008-08 through 2013-14

The “Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees” as revised on November 25, 2008, delineate a working understanding between the Senate and the Administration regarding a) the selection of faculty members for such committees, b) dean search procedures, and c) dean review committee procedures (see attached). The Guiding Principles, in setting out best practices both for Dean’s searches and Dean’s performance reviews, also stipulate annual Senate assessments with data on dean’s searches and reviews.

This annual assessment was not done since fall of 2008, but this year the Academic Senate formed a special committee to look back over the search and evaluation process to see whether the Guiding Principles were known to the committees, whether they were followed (closely, loosely, not at all), and whether they were helpful or not. The special committee also wanted to find out what forum was used to solicit advice from the school faculty on priorities and needs, whether school faculty were consulted on the short list of candidates, and whether there were any problems with confidentiality or communication in the process.

At least one member of the 2013-14 Senate special committee contacted at least one member of each of the search or evaluation committees for the 2008-2013 period for a brief interview. This report will summarize the detailed discussions the Senate committee had with representatives from all those search or evaluation committee processes we were able to reconstruct. Members of the special committee were Steve White (Physical Sciences), Jutta Heckhausen (Social Ecology), and Peter Krapp (Humanities). Initially, past Senate Chair Craig Martens was a member as well, but he recused himself once he accepted a part-time administrative appointment as Associate Vice Provost for Academic Planning.

This report will obviously not touch on searches or reviews that are currently incomplete. It is worth mentioning that one completed Dean search and two Dean reviews are also not covered in this report, because they had no formal Senate involvement. Specifically, the special committee is not aware of Senate faculty members involved in any committee leading to the appointment of the Dean of the School of Education, in the review of the Dean of Biology in 2012, or in the review of the Law School Dean in 2013. If these three search or evaluation processes had faculty serving on any respective committees, they were not populated through the Senate as stipulated by the Guiding Principles.

Finally, this report makes some specific recommendations - both regarding the current practice in relation to the Guidelines, and pertaining to the Guidelines themselves.

Academic Senate Report on the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees”, 2008-08 through 2013-14

The School of the Arts Dean search 2008-09 did have an open faculty forum to solicit input, and an open invitation to come talk to the committee. In addition, the committee contacted some prominent faculty to get their input. It was felt within the School that this was a good practice to head off problems from faculty who are used to having a lot of influence. Not all internal candidates were interviewed, only those that had made a cut. The search was confidential, and it was widely agreed that it must be. After the committee transmitted names to the EVC, the candidates were invited to UCI, and their identities were widely known. The administration wanted an unordered short list, as usual; except for the possibly premature exclusion by the search committee of internal candidates, there was no problem with the search process. The EVC reported back to the chair of the committee on his decisions and the results.

The latest Dean search in the Biological Sciences in 2013 was an open search, but the shortlist was dominated by internal candidates. There was no formal forum to solicit faculty input from the school, but since the finalists were well known to all faculty, there may not have been a need for it. Moreover, there was not a lot of confidentiality at that stage; all finalists met with key staff in the dean’s office and with representatives from the departments. After the committee provided the Provost with a short list, the Provost met with the committee to discuss them.

The Business Dean Search started in fall 2012, but the first round did not lead to hiring because the chosen candidate rejected the offer, so the search was reopened. Mort Pincus as Chair of the search committee had drafted a statement about priorities and then everybody provided input. Shortlisted candidates came for airport interviews in total confidentiality, and the final four candidates each visited for two days. They were seen by a faculty forum and had individual meetings with faculty; these were announced several days before, and there had been a joint discussion of faculty about the process. The committee also solicited written comments with faculty, staff and students. The committee had a discussion with the EVC and the Chancellor about finalists, but the decision was announced to all faculty at once.

The Engineering Dean search 2010-11 featured no faculty forum to solicit input on priorities, and no interviews of faculty. However, the search committee got that information from the school’s faculty representatives on the committee. Notably, all internal candidates were interviewed, and the committee got valuable insight on the school’s needs from that set of interviews. Faculty members recommend this practice highly, even for candidates less likely to be selected. The search was confidential, and after past experiences in the School, the committee agreed that it must be. After the committee transmitted a shortlist to the EVC/P, candidates were invited to UCI and their identities were widely known. The administration wanted an unordered short list, which faculty agree with. - It should be noted that after the short list of candidates became known, some engineering faculty not serving on the committee sent a letter directly to the Chancellor stating they would not support a tenured appointment for one candidate. This kind of circumvention of the process appears to be highly inappropriate, particularly in bypassing the committee and the EVC by writing to the Chancellor. The EVC consulted further with the committee after this event, and later reported back to the committee on his decision.

Academic Senate Report on the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees”, 2008-08 through 2013-14

The Humanities Dean search in 2012 was a national search, but nominations for internal candidates were also solicited. There was no formal faculty forum to provide input for the search committee, but the School held faculty meetings as the search was announced to help formulate priorities. None of the internal candidates made the shortlist, but unlike in the previous Humanities Dean search, there were no attempts from school faculty to influence the central administration. Four finalists met on campus with selected department chairs and program directors, and the final decision was communicated to the committee before being announced to the campus.

The Information and Computer Science Dean search in 2010 started with an open meeting of faculty in preparation of the dean search, where criteria for dean search were discussed. Then the committee members interviewed faculty for candidate nominations. This search was kept school-internal. There were open forums where faculty had an opportunity to talk to the two finalists. The EVC/P met with the committee to hear about their views of the final selection of candidates. There also was a debriefing meeting just before the selection was announced to the campus.

The School of Medicine Dean search in 2009 involved faculty representing both the clinical and the basic science emphases within the School, and as the School has a robust culture of shared governance, the process included sufficient levels of consultation. Department chairs and other pillars of the School felt included in the search process, although there were no open forums. The decision was communicated to the committee before being announced to the campus.

The Physical Sciences search 2011-12 offered no open faculty forum to solicit input on priorities, and no candidate interviews with the faculty at large. There was a broad call for nominations of potential candidates; all the candidates were internal, so there was no second stage where candidates were invited to UCI. There did not seem to be an explicit mechanism to get priorities from the faculty (although the committee was pretty large). Not all nominated candidates were invited for interviews. The search was confidential, and the committee agreed it must be. The administration wanted an unordered short list; the EVC did not report back to the committee on his decision, so that committee members found out the resulting selection of Dean via a non-committee route.

The Social Ecology Dean search in 2010 only had an Advisory Committee, not a real Dean Search Committee. It was an internal search. The committee held only one meeting, did not discuss an ad, and there seem to have been very few candidates. Yet faculty were happy with the procedure, the interim Dean became Dean, and there were extensive discussions about the future of the school, which involved each and every faculty member. This may be seen as more than sufficient faculty consultation.

In the Social Science Dean search in 2013, lots of effort was invested to solicit nominations from faculty; the committee solicited applications from all nominees. Only department chairs met with shortlisted candidates. Finally during the interview visit faculty could meet candidates and ask questions and provide feedback to committee. There was no final debriefing before the final decision was announced to the campus.

Academic Senate Report on the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees”, 2008-08 through 2013-14

The committee reviewing the Dean of the Graduate Division in 2009 solicited feedback from around the campus, but no open forums were held. In a review process, consultation of stakeholders is part and parcel of the process, and so it was in this case. Detailed results of the review were not publicized to campus.

The committee reviewing the Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Education in 2010 solicited feedback from around campus, but no open forums were held. As always in a review process, input from stakeholders all around campus was integrated into the deliberations. The feedback process turned into a debate about centralization or decentralization of the DUE portfolio. Detailed results of the review were not shared with the campus.

Overall, our impression is that EVC/P Gottfredson hewed closely to the Guiding Principles, but that Interim EVC/P Susan Bryant and especially Chancellor Drake did less so during the transition to the new EVC/P. We recommend that the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees” continue to be used in each search of review of Deans on campus. There is little doubt that the document has shown itself to be useful and effective when it is known and referred to in such processes. We also recommend that review committees be treated like search committees as covered in the Guiding Principles, which they have not been in all cases in the period covered by this report. Although the Guiding Principles do not mention Vice Provosts, these are academic administrative positions that are in many ways analogous to Deans, and arguably the Guiding Principles could apply to those titles also. Now that at least the next DUE Dean will also be titled Vice Provost, and perhaps the next Dean of the Graduate Division will be titled analogously, we nonetheless assume that the search and review of those two Vice Provosts who are currently called Deans will still be covered by the Guiding Principles.

Submitted by

Steve White (Physical Sciences)
Jutta Heckhausen (Social Ecology)
Peter Krapp (Humanities)

Endorsed by the Senate Cabinet on June 17, 2014

Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees

University of California, Irvine

Authority for Dean Appointments and Reviews is addressed in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM):

APM 240-40: “The Chancellor has the authority to appoint a Dean or Provost...”

APM 240-10: “Criteria for appointment and evaluation of a Dean or Provost shall be developed by each Chancellor or designee.”

I. SELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS FOR DEAN SEARCH AND DEAN REVIEW COMMITTEES

1. On behalf of the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVC/P) will request, from the executive committee or faculty chair of the school in question (in the case of academic deans), the names of a minimum of four faculty members from the School for service on a Dean search or review committee. In doing so, the executive committee or faculty chair will confirm that the following conditions hold true for each of its nominees:

- (a) Availability of the nominee to serve;
- (b) Willingness of the nominee to confirm that there is no conflict of interest with the search or review;
- (c) Willingness of the nominee to maintain confidentiality as is usual for personnel processes.

2. On behalf of the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost will request, from the Academic Senate Committee on Committees, the names of a minimum of four faculty members whom they recommend for service on the Dean search or review committee. In the instance of searches or reviews for the Dean of the Graduate Division or Dean of Undergraduate Education, the other set of 4 or more nominations will be provided by the Graduate Council or the Council on Educational Policy, respectively. In doing so, the Senate will confirm that the following conditions hold true for each of its nominees:

- (a) Availability of the nominee to serve;
- (b) Willingness of the nominee to confirm that there is no conflict of interest with the search or review;
- (c) Willingness of the nominee to maintain confidentiality as is usual for personnel processes.

3. The Chancellor or EVC/P will appoint the search or review committee. As a general practice, one-half of the committee members will be selected from faculty nominated through the above methods.

4. The Chancellor or EVC/P will consult with the Senate Chair prior to appointing chairs of Dean search or review committees. In general, chairs of review committees shall not be currently appointed deans.

II. DEAN SEARCH COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

1. The dean search committee will at the beginning convene a forum inviting faculty to discuss School priorities, School needs, and desired criteria for the next Dean.
2. The committee shall advise the Chancellor and EVC/P regarding the most appropriate manner for final candidates to be invited for interviews. Should the committee recommend confidentiality, it should seek additional faculty consultation that balances the desired need for confidentiality with broad input from faculty.
3. Faculty involved in this process will have the opportunity to provide written evaluations regarding the final candidates, and those evaluations shall be reviewed by the committee and the Chancellor and EVC/P.
5. At the conclusion of the search process, the Chancellor and/or EVC/P will meet with the search committee in order to report on the outcome of their deliberations and negotiations.
6. If for any reason the above procedures do not yield an acceptable dean, the Chancellor and/or EVC/P shall ask the committee to continue the search. Should a new committee for the dean search become necessary, the above procedures shall be initiated from the beginning.

III. DEAN REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

1. The dean review committee will send out a call to all faculty in the School for written evaluations of the strengths and weaknesses of the current dean, along with recommendations for improvements, and, if desired, an indication of whether the dean should be reappointed. These evaluations shall be reviewed by the committee and treated with strict confidentiality.
2. The committee shall evaluate the work of the dean during the review period, including the faculty statements and written input from the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) and other councils judged relevant, and prepare a report to the Chancellor and EVC/P that includes a recommendation regarding reappointment/non-reappointment, including the desired term of appointment. All materials shall be treated with strict confidence.
3. The Chancellor or EVC/P shall meet with the committee in order to learn of their recommendations. The Chancellor or EVC/P shall also meet with the committee to discuss the final outcome of the review.

IV. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT

At the end of each academic year, the Irvine Division of the Senate will compile, based on data received from the EVC & Provost's office, a report of the dean's searches and dean's reviews conducted during that year.