

Minutes, April 18, 2012

Chair

Ezra B. W. Zubrow

Secretary

Edward Herman

Architecture & Planning

Despina Stratigakos

Arts & Sciences

William H. Baumer

Melvyn Churchill

Engineering & Applied Sciences

Ann Bisantz

Joseph Mollendorf

Graduate School of Education

Suzanne Miller

Management

Larry Sanders

Teresa Quattrin (Excused)

Nursing

Mary Carey

Pharmacy

Alfred Reiman

Social Work

Kathleen Kost

SUNY Senators

Adly Fam

Jennifer Gottdiener

Donald Grinde

Peter Nickerson

University Libraries

Michael R. Lavin

Parliamentarian

William H. Baumer

Guests

EDAAA --Sharon Nolan-Weiss

Professional Staff Senate --Ann Marie Landel

Provost (Interim)—Bruce McCombe

- FSEC approved **minutes** of its **March 21, 2012** meeting.
- **Chair's Report:**
- Zubrow told FSEC that he "stalked" prospective new students on university tours emphasizing to them the faculty's interest in their education.
- Zubrow and the Interim Provost McCombe discussed plans for a joint Budget Priorities Committee.
- **Provost's Report:**
- McCombe said that the university's new mission statement is nearly complete and is awaiting approval by President Tripathi. It includes more concrete goals than the earlier statement.
- The university will hire a copy editor to synthesize reports of the various Middle States accreditation committees into a consistent document.
- The new 3E review committee will include 2 people from each decanal unit, plus 3-4 people nominated by FSEC.
- The new Provost, Charles Zukoski, will begin his duties in mid-July/early August.
- The new university budget model created by Sean Sullivan is not yet ready for implementation.
- **Decanal Reviews**

- S. Miller presented information about decanal reviews (Appendix 1) and a motion requesting that “the current UB Decanal Review Procedures be revised to create a UB Decanal Review Policy...” (Appendix 2).
- [Appendices 3 and 4 include additional information about decanal review that FSEC did not discuss.]
- Appendix 3: FSEC resolution (1994) and an excerpt of minutes of a Faculty Senate meeting (likely 1994, but the date is uncertain).
- Appendix 4: *Procedure for the Review of Academic Deans*. February, 1994.
- Procedures, but not practices, of decanal review at UB are codified. Thus, review committees do not work with consistent information. Committee chairs determine the nature of the reviews. In one case, the chair determined that the members of his/her committee should not see the final report. Miller believes the University needs more exacting details that govern reviews consistently.
- Support provided by the Provost to decanal review committees is not uniform because committee chairs negotiate the terms.
- Miller argued that procedures of decanal review do not guarantee confidentiality expected during personnel reviews. In her view, UB lacks the institutional culture required for effective decanal review.
- J. Mollendorf asked what are we attempting to accomplish when considering decanal reviews, what should be expected of Deans, and should similar review be applied to department chairs?
- Interim Provost McCombe maintained that:
 - The importance of confidentiality in decanal reviews is no different from that of tenure reviews. Review committees require flexibility because different schools have diverse needs. For example, professional schools and academic departments have dissimilar focuses.
 - Regardless of the school key questions ought to answer, what can Deans learn about their personal performances and that of their schools?

- Responding to Miller who said that the university often fails to review units within the required 5-year time frame, McCombe pointed out that reviews became more regular after Tripathi became Provost.
 - McCombe agreed that the process should be better codified without threatening the Dean. He thought that interim reviews can be less threatening.
 - Faculty can sometimes feel threatened as well. In one case, faculty did not want to be interviewed by colleagues who work within the same school.
-
- D. Grinde said that at other schools faculty appreciate standard questions that are answered anonymously when analyzing effectiveness of their Dean. He also thought that Deans should be evaluated by both the University administration and faculty/staff in their respective schools.
 - K. Kost believes that standardized general questions about all Deans are appropriate, but additional queries ought to be specific to particular schools.
 - Zubrow asked if it is appropriate to blame the university for failure to conduct decanal reviews regularly when department chairs often fail to review faculty and professional staff annually as required by the *UUP Contract*. McCombe added that reviews of management confidential staff are irregular.
 - A. Fam said that he remembers one decanal review in engineering during his 35 years at UB.
 - M. Lavin thought that new Deans ought to be evaluated more frequently than experienced ones. Frequent constructive feedback will help them personally and will benefit their schools.
 - Miller believes that decanal reviews should distinguish between dysfunctional schools and dysfunctional leadership.
 - An AAU statement on decanal review can help UB develop improved procedures and policies.
 - FSEC approved a motion to create a committee to review and evaluate the University's decanal review policy in context of offering constructive criticism.

- **Faculty Senate Listserv:** FSEC approved the policies and guidelines for the Faculty Senate Listserv prepared by E. Herman. (Appendix 5)
- FSEC went into executive session.

Prepared by
Edward Herman, Secretary
Faculty Senate

Appendix 1

UB Decanal Review

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

The following questions and issues have been raised by faculty in several UB units. With a bit of research, it became clear that

- (A) the FSEC has taken up the issue of UB Decanal Review in the past;
- (B) Decanal Review policies are codified by AAU and by AAU institutions;
- (C) UB Decanal Review policies appear to be missing important components.

Issues and questions raised by faculty:

- Procedures for Decanal Review at UB vary according to the Decanal Review committee Chair selected. Other SUNY centers have policies about the decanal review that codify the process (e.g., Binghamton) and other AAU institutions (e.g., Indiana University, UCLA) post these policies on the university website. What body would be most appropriate to take up the creation/revision of such policies to systematize this process? Is this something that could begin in the Faculty Senate Executive committee?
- How can the Decanal Review Committee have access to data collected by UB, SUNY, or other sources outside the Decanal unit (e.g., student entrance scores, tenure rates, grants, publications, etc., hiring and retention, diversity, and the COACHE survey of faculty satisfaction), rather than relying only on sources of information internal to the school?

- Recent Decanal reviews surfaced strong concerns about confidentiality of the interviews and surveys. In what ways might Decanal Committees do their work without raising such concerns about confidentiality?
- Communicating the specific procedures of the review to inform faculty and staff at the beginning of the process would encourage participation and assuage fears about participating.
- If surveys of the decanal unit are to be done, would it be possible to create an instrument that would regularly be used, with core survey questions and room for flexibility to add school-specific questions?
- After a process of providing comments in writing and interview, faculty and staff at UB receive no feedback at all on the general findings of the Decanal Review. What ways might be found to provide some public version of the review to those who participated and to faculty in the Decanal unit and perhaps to other stakeholders? What models do other universities use to increase transparency and accountability in the Decanal review processes?
- What is UB's policy for determining the timing of Decanal reviews, and how does that compare to policies at other SUNY branches, to AAU peers, and to best practices? If UB does not have such a policy, should UB have a regular review procedure consistently applied to all Deans, to encourage accountability and excellence in leadership and to allow for faculty involvement? The SUNY Faculty Senate found in a 2005 report that most SUNY campuses have a policy of reviewing Deans every 3 to 5 years, but raised concerns that this is not sufficient to ensure excellence and that an initial one-year review would be consistent with faculty review policies.
- How could the work of Decanal Review committees be better supported and streamlined to improve efficiency in faculty time as well as improve professionalism in the evaluating committees? For example, could administrative and clerical functions be done by support staff assigned to work regularly with such committees, and could an ongoing body or persons be charged with developing expertise, maintaining files, organizing data, researching best practices, and consulting with committees or resolving concerns ?
- How can the Decanal review procedures provide for meaningful follow-up to the review process so that the actions the Dean and higher administration plan in response are transparent to the faculty? One possible barrier to effective reviews and to faculty

participation is the lack of understanding of the outcomes of these reviews and doubt about their value, and the lack of faculty participation in follow up to the review. The AAUP guidelines and North Carolina State example provide mechanisms for such follow-up, such as a requirement for the Provost to discuss with faculty the final report and outcome of the review; the review committee's participation in discussions with the Dean about the Dean's plans to respond to suggestions for improvement; and subsequent reporting to this committee from the Dean and Provost about following through with these plans.

- What was the result of previous Faculty Senate efforts to clarifying and improving the Decanal review process, and what can we learn from these past efforts?

Submitted to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Miller

by Martha McClusky and Suzanne

AAUP DECANAL REVIEW GUIDELINES

Faculty Evaluation of Administrators (2006) [Excerpts]

The report that follows, prepared by a subcommittee of the Association's Committee on College and University Governance, was approved by the full committee for publication.

"The most effective systems of administrator evaluation are those that occur *periodically* as part of a *collaborative* endeavor involving the faculty, the administration, other campus constituencies with a stake in the outcome, and the individual under review. The system should be not only *periodic* (as affecting the individual) but also *regular*, that is, part of the institutional structure, rather than being triggered on an ad hoc basis that requires the reinvention of the wheel for each separate review."

"Most important of all, especially with regard to comprehensive reviews (see next paragraph), the process should be so designed that members of the faculty have reason to believe that their participation in the review has been meaningfully weighed in the outcome. Thus, for example, when the faculty is not provided with a report following a review, there is likely to be pervasive suspicion that its role in the process has not been important. This does not mean that all faculty members

necessarily have the right to a "raw" report in its entirety, only that a trusted representative body of the faculty most directly engaged in its preparation should have the opportunity to know the results/"

"Finally, although our focus is on the *evaluation* rather than the *selection* of academic administrators, in any case in which the appointment of an administrator has taken place over faculty objections and without an adequate response to faculty concerns, or where the faculty has reason to believe that it was insufficiently consulted in the appointment (for example, when the recommendation of a search committee was ignored without good reason), the appointee faces a burden of proving his or her worth that may impair her or his ability to function. It is therefore a matter of simple administrative prudence, as well as sound academic principle, that the appointing administrator take the faculty voice into account prior to making such an appointment, provide compelling reasons stated in detail to justify any overriding of the faculty judgment, and make every effort to ensure that the appointee is advised of faculty concerns and given the opportunity to respond to them."

Evaluative Procedures

What follows is a set of considerations for a comprehensive review in which the expectations for procedural formality are fairly high...

After the Review

The reviewing body, whether standing or ad hoc, should receive a response from the appropriate administrator on the disposition of the report and, if ad hoc, should remain in existence long enough to receive any further information on how the administrator may have responded to constructive criticism, particularly in areas of faculty concern.

At the very least, the release of principles, procedures, and criteria used, and of all survey information, including results, should, if at all possible, be incorporated in the publicly available report.

UCLA DECANAL REVIEW (excerpts)

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.

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.

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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY DECANAL REVIEW (excerpts)

For each of these Deans, a comprehensive review (hereafter referred to as review) shall be conducted early in the fifth year in office and at recurring intervals of four years or more frequently if desired by the Provost/Chancellor. In addition, independent of these comprehensive reviews, each Dean shall be evaluated by a survey distributed to the faculty of the Dean's unit at the beginning of the Dean's third year in office (see section 11). The Provost or Chancellor will provide reasonable and adequate staff and financial support for these review activities.

In the spring semester of each academic year, the Provost and/or Chancellor shall provide the University Faculty Council with a list of all Core School Deans subject to review the following year. The Provost/Chancellor shall request the creation of Review Committees simultaneously with the announcement of the Deans to be reviewed in order to allow at least one semester for completion of the Review process. Review committees will normally be established early in the fall semester and each review process will normally be completed early in the succeeding spring semester, or before. Each review committee will be assured of enough time to complete its work in a manner consistent with its charge.

Surveys shall be conducted as follows:

- A. A survey shall be conducted at the beginning of a Dean's third year in office. Thereafter, a survey shall be conducted as part of each comprehensive review.
- B. The Provost/Chancellor shall appoint an independent agent (such as the IUB Center for Survey Research or the IUPUI Survey Research Center) to design and conduct the survey.
- C. The survey shall be in three parts:.....

Copies of the reports of the Reviews of the Deans listed 1.A-F and 2.A-B above shall be conveyed to the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council, the Agenda Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council, the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Faculty Council, and to the Dean's elected Policy Committee or corresponding elected governing body.

The Provost/Chancellor, in consultation with the UFC Agenda Committee and Review Committee chair, shall determine what elements of the final report and the Provost/Chancellor's response should be included in a public summary document. That document must include an accurate characterization of the results of any data collection activities conducted by the Review Committee, although stakeholders' verbatim quotes should not be included. The summary report should be distributed to all faculty and staff in the applicable core school.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE DECANAL REVIEW (excerpts)

6. Review and Report by the Provost

6.1 After the Provost reviews the results of the evaluation with the Dean, the Provost shall report the evaluation results at a meeting of the college faculty and staff. The meeting of the college faculty and staff should occur as soon as possible, but no later than May 15 of the academic year or by fiscal year end for colleges with predominantly fiscal year appointments.

6.2 These procedures do not preclude a faculty or staff member, Department Head, Assistant/Associate Dean, or other unit employees from individually expressing views with regard to college leadership and programs to the Provost at any time.

6.3 These procedures do not preclude the Provost from consulting with the Chancellor regarding the college leadership at any time.

6.4 Documents generated through this process are confidential personnel records and shall be treated as such as required by North Carolina law.

SUNY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE (excerpts)

Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

A Report by the Governance Committee
Of the SUNY University Faculty Senate

2005

Most bylaws or governing documents specify that senior administrators be evaluated every three to five years.

There is no easy solution to this problem, but one campus has a published record of the evaluation cycle, and the *governance secretary* simply informs all parties at the beginning of the academic year that a review is required for specific individuals.

Oversight

It is most important that the practice of faculty evaluation of administrators be monitored by an individual or individuals who is not a member of the evaluating committee and who is directly

answerable to the faculty and professional staff and ultimately to the larger college community. In practice this is typically the campus governance leader working in cooperation with the governance executive committee. While generally not participating in the evaluation, these individuals will typically initiate the evaluation of specific individuals on a regular basis as determined by the faculty bylaws and will provide oversight for the process.

In some instances, only the committee, the individual evaluated and his or her immediate supervisor see the survey data. In other cases, a summary is presented to the CGL and the executive committee; it may also be placed in a public place such as the campus library. Before the summary is prepared, the individual evaluated may have the opportunity to respond in writing to the results of the survey, and these comments may be acknowledged in the committee report. At one campus, the tabulated responses and edited, selected prose comments are placed on the restricted campus website for all members of the university community to access.

Whatever method of dissemination is employed is obviously a function of local practice and negotiation, but where faculty and professional staff see none of the results of the evaluations, a sense of mistrust and futility may result. **Consequently, it is recommended that individuals participating in the survey have access to *some version* of the results, even if it is only an edited summary.**

The University Faculty Senate can take on an important role in affirming the importance of faculty evaluation of administrators by encouraging Campus Governance Leaders to revisit mechanisms for evaluation which may already be in place at their campuses, or where none exist, to examine the practices at those campuses which are successfully accomplishing this goal and, as necessary, adapt them to their own needs.

UB DECANAL REVIEW PROCEDURES (excerpts)

Procedure for the Review of Academic Deans February, 1994

Process Review

This process shall be reviewed and amended as required and will be subject to a formal review of its effectiveness no more than five years after its adoption.

[Note: The original Faculty Senate resolution endorsing a decanal review process was adopted 4/17/90 by a vote of 45/0/2; the material presented in [Attachment C](#) resulted from discussion between the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost.]

A review at least once every five years is recommended. However, a new dean can benefit markedly from a review during the initial years of his or her appointment. A dean new in the post requires sufficient time to deal with those institutional problems which inevitably await a new administrator. These are often the obdurate problems left by previous administrators which are now identified as important priorities for resolution under a new administrator. The decanal review cycle should allow for an appropriate transition period for a new administration, a sufficient period of time for the administrator to develop working relationships, and an adequate base of experience from which he or she might be evaluated. A preliminary review in the third year of the service of each dean's initial appointment allows an opportunity to assess progress within the unit and the effectiveness of the dean in responding to the challenges which awaited him or her upon appointment. At the same time, the Provost and Dean will reach agreement on those goals to be assessed at the fifth year review.

Outcomes

Deans should be accountable in the same spirit in which employee evaluations are conducted throughout the institution. The review process should be viewed as an exercise which assists the dean in understanding and meeting the needs and expectations of the administration, faculty, students, and external constituencies which he or she serves. At its conclusion, the process should have established a set of agreed-upon goals and expectations to stimulate and guide the work of the dean.

Appendix 2

In UB's pursuit of Academic Excellence for UB2020, the Decanal Review process can provide a mechanism for maintaining excellence at the School level. The AAU policy and the SUNY Faculty Senate report on Decanal Reviews define several important components that do not appear in UB's Decanal Reviews or Procedures.

I move that the FSEC request that the current UB Decanal Review Procedures be revised to create a UB Decanal Review Policy that includes

- (A) Regularly scheduled reviews of each Dean every five years (or sooner for new Deans) with administrative, clerical and other support;
- (B) Consistent procedures for comprising each Decanal Review Committee;
- (C) Codified processes for review that specify opportunity for confidential interviews with faculty;
- (D) A professionally constructed and disseminated survey to be used in each review, with space for decanal-specific questions;
- (E) Decanal Review Committee access to central administration information (e.g., student entrance scores, tenure rates, grants, publications, etc., hiring and retention, diversity, and the COACHE survey of faculty satisfaction, specific data relevant to diversity, and results of exit interviews—especially of women and under-represented minorities).
- (F) A clearly specified post-review process for the Decanal Committee, and for feedback to faculty of the review findings, including a public version of the report for members of the school.

Appendix 3

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

D. Faculty Role in Evaluation of Deans

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate commends the Provost for his proposed "Procedures for the Review of Academic Deans, February, 1994," accepts it as being generally consistent with previously expressed Faculty Senate concerns, and urges its immediate implementation.[See Appendix 4] for text of the procedure)

[passed by the Faculty Senate on 3/1/94 by voice vote]

UB Faculty Senate Minutes on Decanal Review

**(It is uncertain if these minutes are from the
March 1, 1994 meeting described immediately above.)**

On the second topic, Professor Welch noted that a few years , then Acting Provost Ken Levy had attempted to carry out an evaluation of six Deans, who found the process not well-suited to several Schools. Levy had found "tremendous resistance" to the implementation of the evaluation, as well as little interest in several of the Schools. The Chair said that Provost Headrick pointed out that the evaluations of some Deans with several years of service might be moot in the short term because of impending retirements, but felt nevertheless that evaluations of Deans is important. Of paramount importance for the FSEC, the Chair noted, is the need to discuss the weaknesses of previous evaluation procedures; the Committee should discuss this with the governance units of the various Faculties and Schools.

The Chair invited Senior Vice-Provost Levy to comment on the matter. Senior Vice- Provost Levy noted that the evolution of the process lasted nearly two years; in its first form, it was not acceptable to former President Steve Sample and needed to be "fine-tuned" through joint faculty-administration cooperation. Senior Vice-Provost Levy mentioned that any single set of procedures, when applied to the different disciplines and cultures on campus, will run into problems. He advised the FSEC to consult with the faculty governance bodies and to build some "latitude" into the evaluation process.

Professor Welch stressed that decanal evaluation should be formative, i.e. should provide useful insight as to how to improve; concurrent with these evaluations, he added, should be an effort to build a sense of trust, implying a certain degree of confidentiality in the evaluations. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Professor Nickerson made clear that the committees responsible for the previous evaluation were indeed able to carry it out, despite problems of identifying people agreeable to both the faculty governance structures and the Deans. Senior Vice-Provost Levy agreed, but said the majority of the schools either had problems with the evaluation or did not wish to participate. Professor Nickerson stressed that this is a constructive process, and that everything, not just the Deans, is being evaluated. Professor asked whether this process also includes the evaluation of chairs. Professor Nickerson replied that that is a separate matter. Professor Miller affirmed that this matter had gone through a series of Senate proposals, and the problem has been going on for at least the last ten

years. Professor Welch noted that the Provost was favorably inclined toward carrying out evaluation, that anyone holding such an office should welcome such an opportunity for evaluation.

Appendix 4

(Copied from

<http://wings.buffalo.edu/faculty/governance/fac-sen/resolutions/res14.htm#IVc>)

Procedure for the Review of Academic Deans February, 1994

The Review of Deans

An effective and regular procedure for the review of deans and decanal units has been discussed at UB for a number of years. It has been generally recognized that a process which is regular, participatory, reasonable and fair is required. As in any productive evaluation of job performance, the process should be formative, not merely summative. Participants in the evaluation should emerge from the process with a keener understanding of decanal responsibilities and the execution of those responsibilities. The dean should be assisted in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of his or her performance and should reach an understanding with the Provost about specific plans to address any concerns which may have emerged from the review process. Satisfactorily addressing these issues should become a formal part of the next evaluation.

Deans serve without specified terms at UB. They serve at the pleasure of the President and can be removed at any time without cause. These provisions guard against the most extreme forms of decanal ineffectiveness or malfeasance. The annual budget and program reviews from the Provost allow for an annual assessment of administrative and management effectiveness. Not systematically addressed is the effectiveness of the dean in the context of the faculty, staff and students and his or her effectiveness in the community and professions. It is upon these aspects that periodic decanal review should concentrate as well as upon broader issues of long-range vision and decanal vitality. A thorough evaluation of the dean's effectiveness within the decanal unit should be undertaken periodically in consultation with representatives of the faculty and with the constituencies of the

decanal unit (alumni, professional societies and the like). The process should allow for a meaningful review without the review becoming a dominating and disruptive aspect of decanal and faculty responsibility.

Process and Timing

While faculty involvement is imperative, the appropriate context for soliciting that involvement differs in the various decanal units. Faculty participation should be tailored to address these realities.

Participation in the process should be centered in a Decanal Review Committee appointed by the Provost. The constituency of this committee will be varied to allow for suitable representation (including student and staff as appropriate) of the specific decanal unit. Nominations for the faculty members of the committee should be received by the Provost from an appropriate faculty body, consistent with the governance structure of the decanal unit. The Provost may appoint from the list, but in as much as the committee is advisory in function, he or she maintains discretion to select other members as well.

The committee's report becomes one element in the Provost's review. Another is a self-evaluation prepared by the Dean, a summary of which will be available to the committee. The committee is to respond to the written guidelines and standards for decanal effectiveness provided to them by the Office of the Provost. These standards will have been developed by the Provost with appropriate consultation and negotiated with the dean at the time of appointment. Solicitation of opinion by the committee should be comprehensive, and confidentiality of responses should be assured.

A review at least once every five years is recommended. However, a new dean can benefit markedly from a review during the initial years of his or her appointment. A dean new in the post requires sufficient time to deal with those institutional problems which inevitably await a new administrator. These are often the obdurate problems left by previous administrators which are now identified as important priorities for resolution under a new administrator. The decanal review cycle should allow for an appropriate transition period for a new administration, a sufficient period of time for the administrator to develop working relationships, and an adequate base of experience from which he or

she might be evaluated. A preliminary review in the third year of the service of each dean's initial appointment allows an opportunity to assess progress within the unit and the effectiveness of the dean in responding to the challenges which awaited him or her upon appointment. At the same time, the Provost and Dean will reach agreement on those goals to be assessed at the fifth year review.

The third year review shall be carried out largely within the decanal unit as an enhanced annual review. The Provost shall solicit the opinion and insights of faculty and other appropriate individuals regarding the effectiveness of the dean. The Provost will review this information with the dean and establish with him or her the performance criteria and goals for the remainder of the cycle. These criteria and the dean's performance within them should be central issues in the fifth year, full evaluation. This evaluation will, in distinction from the third-year review, also involve the external constituencies of the decanal area (alumni, professional societies, etc.) in whatever manner is deemed appropriate by the Provost and the Decanal Review Committee of the dean to be evaluated. Thereafter, the Provost will undertake the full review of each decanal area at his or her discretion, but no less frequently than every five years.

Outcomes

Deans should be accountable in the same spirit in which employee evaluations are conducted throughout the institution. The review process should be viewed as an exercise which assists the dean in understanding and meeting the needs and expectations of the administration, faculty, students, and external constituencies which he or she serves. At its conclusion, the process should have established a set of agreed-upon goals and expectations to stimulate and guide the work of the dean. These will form a framework for the annual performance evaluations of the dean by the Provost. Those involved in the review should emerge with a better understanding of the challenges facing the dean and with keener insights about how faculty and administrative officers might better work together toward advancement of the decanal unit.

Process Review

This process shall be reviewed and amended as required and will be subject to a formal review of its effectiveness no more than five years after its adoption.

[Note: The original Faculty Senate resolution endorsing a decanal review process was adopted 4/17/90 by a vote of 45/0/2; the material presented in [Attachment C](#) resulted from discussion between the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost.]

Appendix 5

(NAME OF LIST)--

Faculty Senate Unmoderated Listserv: Protocol and Guidelines

Purpose of the list

(NAME OF LIST) is an unmoderated listserv that enables University at Buffalo faculty to communicate with each other, discuss issues affecting the faculty, and improve the quality of the work environment. Examples include:

- Learning about resources and information.
- Acquiring advice from others in similar positions.
- Sharing information about teaching/research/service responsibilities and other concerns.
- Identifying common interests.
- Discovering opportunities for growth and development.

Many aspects of faculty working conditions fall within the jurisdiction of the United University Professions (UUP), rather than the Faculty Senate. If uncertain, contact UUP and/or the Chair of the Faculty Senate to determine if your issue is appropriate for this listserv or if it ought to be pursued through the UUP listserv or your union representative.

New faculty are automatically added to (NAME OF LIST), and those who do not wish to receive messages can unsubscribe at any time. Instructions for removing yourself are automatically appended to every message: send a message to listserv@listserv.buffalo.edu with no subject, and a

single line, "signoff (NAME OF LIST)-list" in the body of the message.

Conversely, those who wish to re-subscribe can do so at any time. Forward a message to listserv@listserv.acsu.buffalo.edu with no subject and "subscribe (NAME OF LIST)-list firstname lastname" in the body.

(NAME OF LIST) differs from the Faculty Senate Notification List, which is a notification and announcement list. The Chair of the Faculty Senate uses the Notification List to inform faculty of upcoming meetings and other events. Others cannot post to the Notification List without the Chair's approval.

Netiquette

Faculty Senate Executive Committee expectations are that (NAME OF LIST) users adhere to the following netiquette:

- Communicate in a professional, respectable manner. FSEC expects faculty to disagree. When doing so, refrain from personal attacks, name calling, or any type of juvenile activity that demonstrates lack of respect for colleagues.
- Refrain from commercial promotions. Descriptions of new products or services that might benefit the faculty are acceptable providing they are not advertisements.
- Do not infringe upon copyright or any other violation of intellectual property. Acquire permission from copyright holders before posting protected materials.

University Policy

The UB Computer and Network Use

Policy(http://www.itpolicies.buffalo.edu/Com_Net_Usage/) prohibits:

- Chain Letters: The propagation of chain letters is considered an unacceptable practice by SUNY and is prohibited.

- **Unauthorized Monitoring:** A user may not use computing resources for unauthorized monitoring of electronic communications.
- **Flooding:** Posting a message to multiple list servers or news groups with the intention of reaching as many users as possible is prohibited.
- **Private Commercial Purposes:** The computing resources of University at Buffalo shall not be used for personal or private commercial purposes or for financial gain.
- **Political Advertising or Campaigning:** The use of University at Buffalo computers and networks shall be in accordance with SUNY and University policy on use of University facilities for political purposes.

The **University at Buffalo Listserv**

Policy(<http://itpolicies.buffalo.edu/NewPolicyLibrary/Listserv.pdf>) states that:

“As an academic institution and a New York State government entity, the University supports the concept that freedom of speech and the discussion of unpopular views are important in a free and democratic society. UB IT support staff will not remove content from listserv archives unless the content is in clear violation of University policies or Federal or State laws.”

The Listserv Policy expects users to abide by the following:

- **UB Computer and Network Use Policy**
http://www.itpolicies.buffalo.edu/Com_Net_Usage/
- **UB Email for Mass Digital Communications Policy**
<http://itpolicies.buffalo.edu/NewPolicyLibrary/mass-email-rev4.pdf>

Additional Information

Core Rules of Netiquette

<http://www.albion.com/netiquette/corerules.html>

Summarizes Virginia Shea’s 10 rules described in her book, Netiquette (San Francisco: Albion Books, 1994). More detailed information is at <http://www.albion.com/netiquette/book/index.html>.

Frequently Asked Questions for Listserv Subscribers

<http://listserv.buffalo.edu/user/user-faq.shtml>

Covers subscribing, unsubscribing, sending and receiving messages, suspending delivery, and other basic topics.

Netiquette Quiz

<http://www.albion.com/netiquette/netiquiz.html>

Think you know netiquette? Take this quiz to see how well you do.