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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Tseng</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
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**Process and Timeline:** Provide a brief summary of the year-long process for your working group.

- During the 2017-18 academic year the RRPD Committee will further develop 2 key programmatic elements stemming from the 2015/16 RRPD Committee Final Report:
  1. Frame a comprehensive, efficient, and sustainable faculty entrance/exit interview campus process;
  2. Create an effective approach to better evaluate and collect and assess data on administrative level annual evaluations across campus with goal of inclusion in Digital Measures
  3. The RRPD2 group will produce a final report by May 2018.

**Describe what has been accomplished so far this year.**

The RRPD2 team has met and configured subcommittees for the 2 tasks. Liam Frink will head the team committed to configuring a comprehensive process for administrative evaluation and Katherine Hertlein will lead the team tasked with framing a comprehensive process for collecting faculty qualitative and quantitative data related largely to retention issues.
Identify next steps.

Though the group has 2 subcommittees all members are committed to engaging with both issues; therefore each subcommittee will meet when necessary and the larger group will meet 2 additional times during spring 2018 semester.

What will your final product be at the end of the year? Such as, what metrics which will be used to assess your progress/achievement, will a report be generated, etc?

The committee will prepare a comprehensive report and specifically focus on the interview process and administrative review process. The team will create a comprehensive report on current processes available to faculty at UNLV, relevant data, and models for potential new practices.

You may have reference material to attach to this report. Select from the list.

☐ No additional reference material

OR

☐ Any material generated by this working group (if completed at this time)

Additional information to include (optional).

Click here to enter text.

End of Mid-Year Report

Remainder of the report will be completed in May.
2017-18 Accomplishments.

SWOT Analysis: Determine the strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats presented in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weakness(es)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity(ies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018-19 recommendations and next steps

- What does the SWOT analysis reveal?
- What should the goals / activities be for the subcommittee?
- Who should be responsible?

You may have reference material to attach to this report. Select from the list.

☐ No additional reference material

OR

☐ Any material generated by this working group

Additional information to include (optional).

End of Report
May 21, 2018

Top Tier Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Subcommittee

Action Item Description:
Recruitment, Retention, Promotion, and Diversification Committee RRPD2
Kimberly A. Barchard, Nate Bynum, Liam Frink (Chair), Katherine Hertlein, Han-Fen Hu, Miriam Melton Villanueva, Melva Thompson-Robinson, and Kelly Tseng

The RRPD2 committee was tasked with investigating two aspects of the 2016 RRPD committee report, basic data on UNLV (1) faculty exit and (2) chair evaluation processes. To better investigate our charges, the committee split into two independent teams. Hertlein chaired the exit process group (Bynum, Thompson-Robinson, Tseng), and Frink (Barchard, Hu, and Melton Villanueva) chaired the chair evaluation process group.

Exit Data Report:
The charge to this committee is to evaluate and to make recommendations about campus strategies and support for faculty RRPD. The task for our specific work group was to assess and make recommendations around the exit process at UNLV.

Our workgroup (Chair Hertlein, Bynum, Tseng, and Thompson-Robinson) met on four occasions in late Fall 2017 semester and throughout the Spring 2018 semester. Between meetings, group members were asked to complete tasks prior to the arrival of next meeting time, most notably data collection and fact-finding on particular topics. This involved conversations with key staff, faculty, and administrators. We reviewed current practices within UNLV for exiting faculty and compared our process with Top Tier institutions in hopes to learn best practices. The following recommendations are organized into two types: 1) recommendations regarding the process of exiting UNLV, and 2) recommendations regarding the content. Each group of recommendations are detailed below.

I. Process recommendations
   a. Establish a formalized exit interview/survey process.
The work group could not locate evidence of an exit process for faculty or staff who leave UNLV. The processes that delineate separating from the university are described on these webpages:
   - [https://www.unlv.edu/hr/separating/sep-classified](https://www.unlv.edu/hr/separating/sep-classified)
   - [https://www.unlv.edu/hr/separating/sep-facpro](https://www.unlv.edu/hr/separating/sep-facpro)

   There is no reference to an exit interview on these pages, nor have we been able to uncover evidence that units conduct these on their own. In order to understand why UNLV faculty and staff are not retained at UNLV, the recommendation is to adopt a formalized data collection process in the form of an exit interview/survey at the time of exit to glean circumstances surrounding the separation.

   The recommendation set forth is that one work group be created – composed of both faculty and staff – one whose charge is to develop the process of a faculty and staff exit interview/survey process. This might involve using the tools provided below or starting out with a blank slate. The group would also identify a process of who, how, and where the data from these interviews and surveys would be stored, maintained, and findings reported. This process will be accessible, obvious, and posted publicly. In addition, Human Resources will document that attempts were made to reach out to complete the exit process and obtain exit interview/survey information.
b. Provide a publically accessible intervention plan/flowchart/process for dissatisfied faculty and staff to inform them of the process prior to separation.

Prior to faculty and staff deciding to separate from UNLV, we recommend that they follow an intervention process. The purpose would be to assist dissatisfied individuals through early intervention/early resolution prior to them making the decision to leave UNLV. This recommendation is consistent with the previous RPDD report (March, 2016) which stated, “The content of this process would of course be discreet – however, there needs to be a standardized process for how faculty members are interacted with and how we intervene before we lose faculty.” This flowchart/process would involve helping faculty distinguish between when to go to the Ombuds Office, when to go to the Office of Compliance, and when to seek support from mentors, faculty alliance, or other peer groups.

II. Content recommendations, suggestions, and examples

a. Examples of a formalized exit interview/survey process
   i. This process should be standardized across units.
   ii. The data collected can be both qualitative and quantitative measures (and annual and aggregate reporting and assessment of results).
   iii. Examples of the exit interview/survey include (See Appendix A):
       1. DePaul University: [https://offices.depaul.edu/diversity/advocacy/Documents/Faculty%20Exit%20Interview%20Survey.pdf](https://offices.depaul.edu/diversity/advocacy/Documents/Faculty%20Exit%20Interview%20Survey.pdf)
       2. Florida State
       3. Louisville
       4. Michigan Tech
       5. Mississippi State
       6. North Carolina State: [https://er.hr.ncsu.edu/exit-interview-program/](https://er.hr.ncsu.edu/exit-interview-program/)
       7. Penn State: [https://www.vpfa.psu.edu/exit-interview-officers/](https://www.vpfa.psu.edu/exit-interview-officers/)

b. Develop a plan for managing behavioral issues, if supported by the exit data
   i. If faculty and staff are leaving in part due to behavioral issues on the part of managers and those issues are separate from ones that would be brought to the attention of an Ombuds or Office of Compliance, a plan should be developed to address these issues.
   ii. A workgroup might be created for developing a process to manage the plan.
   iii. This process might be informed by similar processes at Top Tier institutions

c. Faculty Retention Intervention Process
   i. Creation of a process where faculty can begin the process of problem resolution prior to making the decision to leave. Some recommendations include:
      1. The establishment of an Ombuds office consistent with what is described by the International Ombudsman Association (See Appendix B)
         a. In this association, the definition of an ombuds is: “a designated neutral whose major function is to provide informal assistance to constituents of the institution’s community, including students, staff, and faculty, on a confidential basis.” (pg. 1, from [https://www.ombudsassociation.org/IOA_Main/media/SiteFiles/docs/Wilmer-Hale-memo-and-cover-March-2016.pdf](https://www.ombudsassociation.org/IOA_Main/media/SiteFiles/docs/Wilmer-Hale-memo-and-cover-March-2016.pdf))
b. Four key roles held by the ombudsman include: independence (i.e., does not have another function or role at the institution; consistent with Title IX standards), neutrality (advocates for fair process) confidentiality, and informality (“off-the-record”).

c. The Ombudsman may adhere to the Code of Ethics outlined by the International Ombudsman Association, which includes:

d. For more information, visit their website here: https://www.ombudsassociation.org/home.aspx

2. Examine and apply relevant examples (See Appendix C)
   a. Harvard University: https://ombudsman.harvard.edu/
   b. University of California San Diego: https://ombuds.ucsd.edu/
   c. University of Arizona: http://ombuds.arizona.edu/
   d. Western Michigan: https://wmich.edu/ombudsman/

ii. Creation of a Faculty/Staff Advocacy Process
   1. The Faculty Advocacy Group would be one way to develop and improve the campus climate. This group, unlike the Ombudsperson who is neutral, would help faculty and staff improve morale, connect with resources at UNLV, and empower faculty
   2. It may be a division of the National Faculty Alliance or something different
   3. This would be invoked when the faculty/staff member identifies issues within their position and are in a position where to call attention to these concerns to their supervisor would be ill-advised.
   4. An example of the Faculty/Staff Advocacy Process might be to provide information to faculty about how to interact with other entities on campus and what offices might be the most fitting for resolving a particular issue
Faculty Exit Interview

The DePaul Faculty Exit Interview process is designed to collect climate and other qualitative data from exiting faculty to identify environment issues that contribute to turnover, to provide exiting faculty an opportunity to voice concerns and make suggestions, and to identify trends and patterns that will assist in the creation of retention strategies. This information is voluntary and strictly confidential.

Employee Information
Name (optional): __________________________________________________________

Department: ___________________________ Separation Date: ______________________

Do you have a new position?  YES NO

If YES
Title: __________________________________________

How were you recruited for this position?

___ Through an advertisement
___ Through a colleague
___ Recruited by the hiring institution
___ Other _______________________________________

Using the following scale, please rate the following regarding the position you are leaving at DePaul:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = poor</th>
<th>2 = fair</th>
<th>3 = average</th>
<th>4 = very good</th>
<th>5 = outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your compensation relative to the current market value of your discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of your department/school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared governance structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression of DePaul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you rate your department chair/program director/dean’s guidance and support in:

o Helping you understand and meet your expectations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 

o Providing mentoring and professional development opportunities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 

o Evaluating your performance with constructive feedback | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 

o Recognizing your contributions to the department/program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 

o Fostering a collegial environment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 

What were the primary and secondary reasons for your leaving DePaul University?
FSU Faculty Exit Survey

Colleges and Units (Please check one to indicate your primary College/Unit affiliation):

___ Arts & Sciences
___ Business
___ Comm. & Info.
___ Crim. & Crim. Justice
___ Education
___ Engineering
___ Film
___ Fine Arts
___ Human Sciences
___ Law
___ Medicine
___ Music
___ Nursing
___ Social Sci. & Public Policy
___ Social Work
___ University Libraries
___ University School (FSUS)
___ NHMFL
___ Academic Quality/External
___ Academic Affairs
___ Finance & Administration
___ Office of Research
___ Student Affairs
___ President’s Office
___ University Relations

Department/Unit: ____________________________________________________________

Job Title: _________________________________________________________________

1. Why are you leaving FSU? (Please check all that apply)

___ To Accept Other Employment

___ Higher Pay
___ Better Benefits (Please specify): ____________________________________________
___ Work Schedule
___ Career Change
___ Better Working Conditions/Work Environment
___ More Job Security
___ Other (Please specify): _________________________________________________

___ Other Reasons (Please check all that apply)

___ Moving
___ Layoff
___ Educational pursuits
___ Illness/Disability
___ Personal
___ Family (Please specify): ________________________________________________
___ Retirement
___ Contract Ending
___ Terminated
___ Other (Please specify): ________________________________________________
University of Louisville
Faculty Exit Survey

Thank you for your service to the University of Louisville (UofL). The following survey was
developed to provide you an opportunity to share your experience while employed at UofL and
for the university to better understand your reasons for leaving. Your participation is voluntary
and you may decline to answer any question. Your responses are confidential and will only be
included in quarterly summaries for review by a university-wide committee.

Data from these surveys will be used to make recommendations to university administration to
enhance the work climate of all UofL employees. We appreciate your participation.

If you experience any problems while completing this survey, please contact the Office of
Institutional Research & Planning at 502-852-6169 or e-mail irsurvey@louisville.edu. When you
complete the survey, please mail it to the University of Louisville, Office of Institutional Research
& Planning, 305 Miller Information Technology Center, Louisville, KY 40292 or you may fax it to
502-852-2344.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
It's Happening Here.

Marking Instructions:
Example: Correct Mark ☐ ☐

1. Please write the percentage of time you spent annually on the following (should equal 100%)

| % written work assignment (should equal 100%) | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |
| % of time actually spent in each area (should equal 100%) | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |
| % of time you would have preferred (should equal 100%) | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |

About Teaching at UofL

2. Indicate your agreement with the following statements about teaching at UofL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My teaching load was clearly explained to me</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had adequate resources for instructional purposes</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had adequate administrative support</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had adequate technical support</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching load was reasonable</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching was valued</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching was adequately assessed</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did your position involve research? (If no, please skip to question #5)
☐ Yes
☐ No

PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE
Page 1
Michigan Technological University  
Faculty Exit Interview

The goals for implementing a faculty exit interview are to increase faculty retention and improve working conditions at Michigan Technological University. You can contribute to this goal by providing us with your honest opinions about working for Michigan Tech.

Your responses are confidential and anonymous if you choose to not include your name. They will not become part of your personnel file and will not affect future employment opportunities.

We hope that you will take a moment to complete the exit interview survey. You have the option of filling out the form online. Please go to http://www.mtu.edu/equity/equal-opportunity/exit-interview/ to access the online form. If you prefer to fill out the form on paper, please use this form. Your opinions are important to us.

Termination Date (retirement, accepting employment elsewhere, etc) Years at MTU

Race/Ethnicity Gender

Department/Unit Position

Primary Reasons for leaving Michigan Tech University (check all that apply). There is room for comments at the end of this section.

Retirement  
Promotion denial  
Health Reasons  
Improved Career Opportunities/advancement  
Family/Partner (for example: partner career move/moving closer to family/partner attending school)  
Negative Climate  
Lack of Recognition  
Disatisfied with Benefits  
Quality of Supervision  
Work Load or Work Hours  
Discontinuation of Funding  
Laid Off  
Lack of Advancement Opportunities  
Management Practices  
Disatisfied with Local Community  
Pay Disatisfaction  
Conflict with Other Employees  
Other
MEMORANDUM TO: All Holders of Mississippi State University Academic Operating Policy and Procedure Manual

DATE: November 1989

SUBJECT: 13.20 - Exit Interviews of Departing Faculty

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to promote an understanding about the policy related to exit interviews of departing faculty members. Exit interviews of departing faculty members can provide useful information to the administrative decision-making process of this university.

REVIEW

This AOP will be reviewed every four years (or whenever circumstances require an earlier review) by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (APAA) with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

A departing faculty member who wishes, is encouraged to express his/her views or to provide an evaluation of one's working environment, and shall be granted an opportunity for an exit interview with the appropriate department head, director, or dean as requested by the exiting faculty member. Exiting faculty are also strongly encouraged to complete the online Faculty Exit Survey. An invitation to submit the online survey will be sent via email upon notification of resignation to Human Resources Management.

It shall be the responsibility of the appropriate department head, director, or dean to notify the departing faculty member of these opportunities, allowing sufficient time to complete the process (i.e. participate in the interview, sign the report, and if necessary rebut the report) before they depart the university.

If an exit interview is given, a summary report should be prepared by the department head, director, or dean of the departing faculty member(s) for the purpose of addressing any problems or concerns. A possible format for such a report should contain the following information:

1. Date
2. Name, position/rank
3. Date of separation

AOP 13.20
Rev: April 2012
Exit Interviews of Separating Faculty

October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2013
In an effort to better understand the experience of faculty members at Penn State, and to respond to faculty concerns, we need your help. Could you please fill out this survey and return it in the envelope provided within the next two weeks? The Provost’s Office will share the results with college deans or campus chancellors and also with the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

We will compile these data in summary form only. Individual responses will be held in confidence. Naturally, your participation is voluntary, and you may choose to answer all or only part of the survey. You should feel free to make a copy of this instrument, or contact my office and request a copy.

If you would like to discuss this survey, please contact me at bxb1@psu.edu. I truly appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Blannie E. Bowen
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

The literature on academic work suggests a number of influences on faculty careers. How important have the following factors been to you as a faculty member at Penn State? How satisfied have you been with each of these?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE PRACTICES

- Opportunities to participate in University governance
- Opportunities to participate in college governance
- Validity of Penn State’s faculty performance evaluation methods
- Clarity of performance review processes (for P&T salary)
- Rewards for research at the University
- Rewards for teaching at the University
- Rewards for outreach at the University
- The University’s commitment to your field of study
- Formal recognition (such as University and college awards)

An Equal Opportunity University
IOA Standards of Practice

PREAMBLE

The IOA Standards of Practice are based upon and derived from the ethical principles stated in the IOA Code of Ethics.

Each Ombudsman office should have an organizational Chart or Terms of Reference, approved by senior management, articulating the principles of the Ombudsman function within the organization and their consistency with the IOA Standards of Practice.

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE

INDEPENDENCE

1.1 The Ombudsman Office and the Ombudsman are independent from other organizational sections.
1.2 The Ombudsman holds no position within the organization which might compromise independence.
1.3 The Ombudsman ensures that decisions are based on whether or how to act regarding an individual concern, a trend or concerns of multiple individuals or issues.
1.4 The Ombudsman has access to all information and all individuals in the organization, as permitted by law.
1.5 The Ombudsman has authority to select Ombudsman Office staff and manage Ombudsman Office budget and operations.

NEUTRALITY AND IMPARTIALITY

2.1 The Ombudsman is neutral, impartial, and unbiased.
2.2 The Ombudsman strives for impartiality and objectivity in the treatment of people and the consideration of issues. The Ombudsman advocates for fair and equitable administration of process and does not advocate on behalf of any individual within the organization.
2.3 The Ombudsman is a designated neutral, acting to the highest possible level of the organization and operating independently of ordinary line and staff structure.
2.4 The Ombudsman serves no additional role within the organization which would compromise the Ombudsman function. The Ombudsman should not be aligned with any formal or informal association within the organization in a way that might create actual or perceived conflict of interest for the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman should have no personal interest in or to seek, and must not agree to, or have a financial or other personal interest in, the outcome of an issue.
2.5 The Ombudsman has a responsibility to consider the legitimate concerns and interests of all individuals affected by the matter under consideration.
2.6 The Ombudsman helps develop a range of responsible options to resolve problems and facilitate discussion to identify the best options.

CONFIDENTIALITY

3.1 The Ombudsman holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence and takes all reasonable steps to safeguard confidentiality, including the following:
3.2 The Ombudsman does not reveal, and must not be required to reveal, the identity of any individual contacting the Ombudsman Office, nor does the Ombudsman reveal information provided in confidence that could lead to the identification of any individual contacting the Ombudsman Office, without that individual’s express permission, given in the course of informal discussions with the Ombudsman; the Ombudsman keeps specific details related to an individual’s issue only with the individual’s express permission and only to the extent permitted, and even then at the sole discretion of the Ombudsman, unless such action is taken in a way that safeguards the identity of the individual contacting the Ombudsman Office. The only exception to this privilege of confidentiality is where there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm, and where there is no other safer option. Whether this risk exists is a determination to be made by the Ombudsman.
3.3 Communications between the Ombudsman and others (such as those handling the Ombudsman is chosen to act on behalf of) are considered privileged. The privilege belongs to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman Office, rather than to any party to an issue. Others cannot waive this privilege.
3.4 The Ombudsman does not disclose any confidential information outside the organization regarding a visitor’s contact with the Ombudsman or confidential information communicated to the Ombudsman, even if given permission or required to do so. The Ombudsman may, however, provide general, non-confidential information about the Ombudsman Office or the Ombudsman profession.
3.5 If the Ombudsman provides an on-site consultation (i.e., provides feedback to trends, issues, policies and practices), the Ombudsman does so in a way that safeguards the identity of individuals.
3.6 The Ombudsman keeps all records containing identifying information on behalf of the organization.
3.7 The Ombudsman maintains information (e.g., names, phone numbers, appointment schedule) in a secure location and manner, protected from inspection by others (e.g., unauthorized access management), and has a consistent and standard practice for the destruction of such information.
3.8 The Ombudsman provides any keys and/or access in a manner that protects confidentiality.
3.9 Communications made to the ombudsman are not subject to the organization. The ombudsman neither acts as agent for, nor accepts service on behalf of, the organization and shall not serve in a position or role that is designated by the organization as a place to receive service on behalf of the organization. However, the ombudsman may refer individuals to the appropriate person or office where formal notice may be valid.

INFORMALITY AND OTHER STANDARDS

4.1 The Ombudsman functions on an informal basis by such means as: listening, providing and seeking information, identifying and informing issues, developing a range of responsible options, and — with permission and at Ombudsman discretion — engaging in informal third-party intervention. When possible, the Ombudsman helps people identify new ways to achieve their goals.
4.2 The Ombudsman is an informal and effective means of problem resolution of concerns and looks into procedural irregularities and/or broader organizational problems when appropriate.
4.3 The Ombudsman does not make binding decisions or maintain policy, but formally advises issues for the organization.
4.4 The Ombudsman accedes to all issues, but does not resolve any formal concerns. Use of the Ombudsman Office is voluntary and not a required step in any grievance process or organizational policy.
4.5 The Ombudsman does not participate in any formal investigative or adjudicative procedures. Formal investigations should be conducted by others. When a formal investigation is requested, the Ombudsman refers individuals to the appropriate office or individual.
4.6 The Ombudsman identifies trends, issues and concerns about policies and procedures, including potential issue issues and concerns, without breaching confidentiality or anonymity, and provides recommendations for improving addressing them.
4.7 The Ombudsman acts in accordance with the IOA Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, keeps professionally current by pursuing continuing education, and provides opportunities for staff to pursue professional training.
4.8 The Ombudsman endeavours to be worthy of the trust placed in the Ombudsman Office.

www.ombudsassociation.org

Rev. 10/09
University Ombudsman Office

Services

What does the Ombudsman do?

The Ombudsman provides assistance to help manage and resolve workplace and/or academic issues. The Ombudsman can offer neutral and impartial perspective, provide a respectful, confidential place for individuals to discuss problems; help clarify issues and interests, identify goals and develop and consider a range of options; coach visitors in written and verbal communications; explain relevant University policies and practices; provide referrals to other offices and services; look into problems by gathering data and the perspective of others; assist in resolving interpersonal conflict; engage in shuttle diplomacy; facilitate one-on-one and group conversations, or be present in a discussion as a neutral. The Ombudsman can help the visitor weigh options and develop strategies—but it is the visitor’s decision about what to do next. A visitor can discuss concerns with the Ombudsman without committing to further disclosure, taking action, or seeking formal resolution.

The Office also provides information to University leadership on general trends and patterns of complaints without breaching confidentiality so that problems may be prevented from escalating or recurring.

Contact the Ombudsman

University Ombudsman Office
Overview

THE OMBUDS PROGRAM IS
A confidential, informal, impartial, and independent resource for effective communication, collaboration, and conflict management.

WE SERVE
All levels of UA employees and students, in all units and colleges, as well as others who have a university-related concern.

WE HELP
With a wide variety of issues, concerns, questions, conflicts, and challenges.
- Teams/units wanting to work together most effectively or harmoniously
- Difficulties with co-workers, supervisors, and employees
- Challenges with professors, advisors, and students
- Issues with team members or coaches
- Glares of style – including communication, conflict, personality, work and leadership styles
- Department/institute climate and culture
- Concerns related to equity, fairness, and respect
- Concerns about career progression
- Concerns about supervisor or employee effectiveness
- Intra and inter-departmental issues
- Systemic and long-standing issues
- Identifying and connecting with appropriate resources and channels for assistance
- Clarification of university policies and procedures
- And more

WE WORK ON MANY LEVELS
From one-on-one to small and large groups, from individual to departmental, organizational, and systemic level concerns/issues.

CONFLICT AND OTHER CHALLENGES IMPACT THE UA COMMUNITY
Related to their concern/situation, Ombuds Program visitors report experiencing high levels of stress/anxiety, damage to or loss of important professional and/or personal relationships, job-related stress or burnout, loss of confidence, difficulty focusing on work/school, detrimental impacts to physical and/or mental health, reputational impact/damage, and more.

Are you unsure of how to handle a complex, tense, or unclear situation with a colleague, employee, supervisor, or with your entire team or department? Are you interested in responding to a situation in the most effective way possible? Do you have a situation that has gone out of hand? We invite you to contact us to help you move forward in a responsive and positive manner, no matter how small, large, or exactly your situation may be. If it isn’t something we can assist you with directly, we can connect you to other helpful resources.
About the Office of the Ombuds

What is the Office of the Ombuds?

The UC San Diego Office of the Ombuds provides confidential, neutral, and informal dispute resolution services for the UC San Diego community. The office is available to assist faculty, staff, students, non-UCSD academics, postdoctoral trainees, and employees of UC San Diego Health System (UCSD Medical Center and related facilities) who seek guidance with the resolution of academic or administrative issues and disputes. Its services supplement, but do not replace, other administrative processes at the University. The office works to facilitate communication and assist parties in reaching mutually acceptable agreements in order to find fair and equitable resolutions to concerns that arise at the university. The ombuds office also reports general trends of issues and provides feedback throughout the organization, and advocates systemic change when appropriate without disclosing confidential communications.

The ombuds office functions independently with respect to case handling and issue management and reports to Ethics and Compliance in the Chancellor's office for administrative and budgetary purposes but not regarding the substance of matters discussed in the office. Its services supplement other administrative processes and formal grievance procedures available at the University. When providing services, the ombuds staff adheres to The International Ombudsman Association Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice which may be found on our website.

What is the origin of the term "ombuds" and the profession?

The position of ombudsman was originally created in Sweden in 1809. The Swedish Parliament appointed an ombudsman to resolve difficult problems in the absence of the country's abdicated king. In more recent times, ombuds programs have been created throughout the world to assist citizens, consumers and employees who wish to address concerns about administrative actions or lack of action. In the United States, the various types of ombuds functions are utilized in state and local governments, nursing homes, the media, colleges and universities, corporations, prisons and agencies of the federal government.

Eastern Montana College was the first educational institution in the United States to appoint an ombudsperson in 1968. In 1967, Michigan State University became the first major U.S. University to establish an ombuds office. During the period of nationwide campus unrest in the late 1960's and early 1970's, a number of universities established ombuds programs in an attempt to respond to demands for a neutral, confidential and "safe" place to discuss concerns and voice complaints. It is now estimated that more than 200 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada have established ombuds offices. The majority of the University of California campuses have ombuds programs, some of which started as early as 1969. The UC San Diego Office of the Ombuds was established on April 22, 2002 by Chancellor Robert C. Dynes as an organizational ombuds office to serve as an alternative channel for communication and issue resolution and was established as part of a comprehensive plan to increase communication and feedback at UC San Diego.

History excerpted from the University and College Ombuds Association handbook.

How can I meet with the Ombudsperson?

Our office is located in La Jolla on the main campus adjacent to the Gillman Parking Structure and across the street from the Medical School.

To make an appointment, please call 858-534-0777.
About

WHAT DOES THE OMBUDSMAN DO?

The Western Michigan University ombudsman will:

- Listen to you and discuss your problems and concerns, identifying and evaluating with you options to resolve problems.
- Provide information on resources within the University that may help you.
- Open avenues of communication, investigate complaints, and gather information.
- Serve as a neutral party to solve problems and resolve conflict. The ombudsman does not take sides, but works to achieve fair outcomes.
- Identify problem areas facing faculty, staff, and students and recommend changes in University policies and procedures.

WHAT DOESN’T THE OMBUDSMAN DO?

The University ombudsman does not:

- Act as an advocate for you in a dispute. The ombudsman is neutral and impartial.
- Represent individuals in appeals or formal grievance procedures either on campus or off.
- Provide legal representation.
- Get involved if you have a non-University related problem or complaint.
- Overturn binding decisions, but can investigate procedural fairness.
- Serve as an office of record. Speaking with the ombudsman is not “notice to the University” of problems or policy violations. Often persons will seek advice from the ombudsman privately, before deciding what actions to take.
Administrative Chair/Director Evaluation Process Report:

UNLV chairs and directors are the front line administrators on campus. Their support and management of our faculty, in particular our junior faculty, are critical for all RRPD matters. The campus evaluation process is essential because it is a primary means to understand the quality and impact of these administrators, and a significant instrument for collecting data on performance, support and training services, and potential interventions.

The administrative evaluations process committee gathered basic data on UNLV unit and department bylaw evaluation processes for administrative department chairs and directors. The reported data is based on evaluation of NSHE, 7 units (with separately reporting departments) and 37 departments’ bylaws. Some observations of these bylaws:

- Of the 37 departments surveyed, 19 do not mention chair/director review in their bylaws. The remaining 18 have a range of detail about the process;
- All units and departments follow guidelines for some kind of evaluation at least 1 time per 3 years;
- It is common to include NSHE language regarding evaluation of “effectiveness and efficiency” but much less so for “level of confidence”;
- Only one department (Journalism) ties evaluation with potential reappointment;
- Evaluations are standardized and processes managed (delivery by Qualtrics is common) by unit Dean’s office;
- Evaluations are commonly quantitative and qualitative;
- Some evaluations are submitted to the Provost;
- Two departments stipulate that the Dean must communicate the results of the evaluation to the faculty (with no process outlined for this communication). EPA requires full text of comments in report;
- Even though the NSHE bylaws require it, most evaluations do not specifically include staff.

Formalizing the Processes of Evaluation Recommendations:

1) Development of basic requirements for chair and director performance (PDQ’s)
   a. Ensure that standardized evaluations line up with description of duties;
   b. PDQ requirements should be addressed when departments choose a chair (not just “who is next”);
      i. Requirements to include criteria for RRPD performance measures;
   c. Offer professional development to support chairs and directors, especially in regards to development of leadership and consensus skills;
   d. Reconsider whether chairs and directors should be evaluated based on annual evaluation criteria (research, teaching, and service) but instead evaluated on criteria in line with their job descriptions;
   e. Integration of process that leads to basic and standardized formative and summative evaluation of performance - review format should measure qualitative factors involved in faculty “confidence”;

2) Assessment should be formative:
   a. Potential interventions of performance need to be based on reviews;
   b. Additional trainings align with assessment;
   c. Units should implement early assessment criteria and process (not to wait till 3rd year of term to evaluate;
   d. Administration should develop intervention process based on evaluations;

3) Assessment measures should be evaluated for value and updated regularly;
4) Design and implement formal processes for communication of results of evaluations;
5) Include UNLV interpretations, definitions, and criteria for both “effectiveness and efficiency” and “level of confidence” and measures to gather these fundamental performance criteria;
6) Chair’s council needs to be part of evaluative process (360 review, peer-to-peer evaluation) and training;
7) Define and develop the role of the Provost’s Office in the evaluation, data collection, training, and intervention process;
8) Formalize the collection of these evaluation data;
  a. Implement interventional and support programs based on data;
9) Develop required benchmark trainings for all chairs (1st year, 2nd year trainings…);
10) Better formalize the connection between a chair’s annual evaluation and performance criteria;
11) Upper administration should develop clear and responsive staged intervention processes based on evaluations and potential other review criteria.

Below are the NSHE, Unit, and Department bylaw sections which address chair evaluations:

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS BYLAWS
Revised August 2016
(formerly Title 5 - NSHE Governing Documents - Chapter 6)

Section 14. Evaluation of Administrators
14.1 Purpose. The purpose of the evaluations shall be improvement of the performance of the administrators during their term of office.

14.3 Evaluation of Administrators Other Than the President. While acknowledging that administrators other than the President are subject to annual evaluations by their supervisors (Nevada System of Higher Education Code Chapter 5, Section 5.12), each college and unit shall develop procedures for allowing a periodic assessment of the level of confidence in which the administrator is held by the academic and nonacademic faculty who report directly to that administrator. These comments may include an assessment of the administrator's performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency. This periodic assessment shall be solicited no less than once every three years, and, when available, it shall be given consideration in the annual evaluation written by the administrator's supervisor. (B/R 2/08) (italics not in original)

ALLIED HEALTH: (Standardized form for evaluations, Qualtrics)
4.4.3 Evaluation of Chair and Associate Dean(s). The school shall establish a mechanism for the evaluation of the Chairs and Associate Dean(s). The Chair evaluation data shall include input of the faculty of the department. The Associate Dean(s) evaluation data shall include input of the faculty of the school. The results of the evaluation shall be shared with the Chair, Associate Dean(s) and the Dean, respectively. Data from the faculty evaluation will contribute to the annual evaluation of the Chair and Associate Dean(s).

Kinesiology and Nutrition Sciences:
1.5.5 The Department Chair shall be evaluated according to the UNLV Bylaws as described in the section entitled "Evaluation of Administrators Other Than the President", Chapter III, Section 14.3. Each administrator shall be evaluated at least once every three years. The faculty, operating as a committee of the whole, shall evaluate the Department Chair every three years. In the intervening years, the Dean shall conduct an evaluation with input from the faculty.

Physical Therapy
2.3.3 An annual evaluation of the Chair will occur in accordance with the provisions of 4.8.

4.8 Chair Annual Evaluation

4.8.1 The PT Chair will be evaluated on an annual basis by the Dean’s office with input from PT faculty according to the criteria established on the current NSHE Code and within the time frame established by the NSHE Code, and in accordance to annual evaluation criteria regarding teaching, research, and service established in the SAHS.

LEE BUSINESS:
2.4 A second year comprehensive evaluation of all Department Chairs is required for each term. Department Bylaws shall contain a procedure by which the Department Chair shall be evaluated. This evaluation shall include input from the faculty, staff, students, and other appropriate administrators. The evaluation shall be submitted to the Dean by an elected review committee in the Department.

Accounting:
3.3 At the spring faculty meeting during the Department Chair’s second year of the three-year term, the department full-time faculty shall elect a three-person committee to carryout [sic] the evaluation of the Department Chair. The committee shall conduct the evaluation in accordance with Section 2.4 of the LBS Bylaws.

Management, Entrepreneurship, and Technology:
B. Nominations for and Review of Chair
The Governance Committee will be responsible for conducting a review of the Department Chair's performance each year. The review will consist of a secret ballot among the Voting Faculty members on the questions,
1. “Do you have confidence in the performance of the Department Chair? _yes _no”
2. “Optional additional comments:”

The Governance Committee shall compile the results and make them available to the dean in a timely manner.

Marketing and International Business:
6.1.9. A performance evaluation of the Department Chairperson shall be conducted by an elected committee of tenured professors in the Department during the second year of each term of the Department Chair. This evaluation shall include input from the faculty, staff, students, and other appropriate administrators and a recommendation on performance. The elected committee shall submit the evaluation to the Dean no later than ten (10) working days after its completion.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING: (Standardized form for evaluations, Qualtrics)
Section 2.1 Officers of the College
2.1.1 The chief administrative officer of the College is the Dean. Other administrative officers include associate and assistant deans, unit chairs, and directors of designated programs, centers, and institutes within the College.
2.6.3 Committee to Evaluate the Dean and Associate Deans
Membership. The Committee to Evaluate the Dean and Associate Deans shall consist of one member from each academic unit in the College selected in accordance with unit Bylaws. The Committee must include at least one staff member.
Function. This committee shall be responsible for establishing the criteria for the periodic evaluation of the Dean and other College administrators in accordance with UNLV Bylaws, Chapter III, Section 14.3, overseeing the process, and
producing final, written evaluation reports. The committee shall conduct such evaluations upon each College administrator no less than once every three years. Such evaluation shall be designed to assess the level of confidence in which each College administrator is held by the academic and nonacademic faculty who report directly to that person. All academic and nonacademic faculty and staff in the College shall be given the opportunity to provide input. The report shall include an assessment of the administrator's performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency. The final evaluation report shall be provided to the administrator being evaluated and a copy shall be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost. When available, these reports shall be given consideration in the annual evaluations written by the administrators’ supervisors.

2.6.3.3 Confidentiality of individual evaluations and comments. Any forms and reports involved in this process shall include a statement regarding the confidentiality of the evaluation. Evaluations completed by individuals shall be compiled by a third party outside the administrator’s office. In order for comments from individuals to be considered in the evaluation, the comments must be signed; however, the name of the person making the comment shall not be released to the evaluated administrator. A signature is not required on an evaluation form if no comments are made. The original evaluations completed by individuals or groups shall not be provided to the evaluated administrator; instead, compiled results should be provided. There shall be no coding of evaluations by unit, using color or otherwise.

2.6.3.4 Response from the evaluated administrator. At a minimum, the evaluated administrator shall notify the Committee of receipt of the evaluation report. Ideally, the administrator would respond in writing to specific items in the review.

Civil and Environmental Engineering:

2.6.3 Committee to Evaluate the Chair

2.6.3.1 Membership. The committee to evaluate the Chair shall consist of at least three Department Faculty members and at least one Department staff member. Nominations of appropriate individuals shall be made to the Dean, and the
Dean shall appoint the committee including selection of the committee chair.

Function. This committee shall be responsible for establishing the criteria for the periodic evaluation of the Chair in accordance with UNLV Bylaws, Chapter III, Section 14.3, overseeing the process, and producing final, written evaluation reports. The committee shall conduct such evaluation of the Chair no less than once every three years. Such evaluation shall be designed to assess the level of confidence in which the Chair is held by the faculty and staff of the Department. All academic and nonacademic faculty and staff in the Department shall be given the opportunity to provide input. The report shall include an assessment of the Chair’s performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency. The final evaluation report shall be provided to both the Chair and Dean. When available, these reports shall be given consideration in the annual evaluations written by the Dean.

Confidentiality of individual evaluations and comments. Any forms and reports involved in this process shall include a statement regarding the confidentiality of the evaluation. Evaluations completed by individuals shall be compiled by a third party outside the Chair’s office. In order for comments from individuals to be considered in the evaluation, the comments must be signed; however, the name of the person making the comment shall not be released to the Chair. A signature is not required on an evaluation form if no comments are made. The original evaluations completed by individuals or groups shall not be provided to the Chair; instead, compiled results should be provided.

Response from the Chair. At a minimum, the Chair shall notify the Committee of receipt of the evaluation report. Ideally, the Chair would respond in writing to specific items in the review.

Electrical and Computer Engineering:
4.7 Annual Evaluation of Chair In order for the Department Chair to get feedback on his/her performance and level of confidence in which he/she is held by the Department faculty, an evaluation by the Department faculty shall be conducted every 12 months of service. The Dean’s office will coordinate the evaluation.

FINE ARTS: Nothing in unit bylaws on review of chairs (Standardized form for evaluations, Qualtrics)

Architecture: College Dean provides an annual evaluation of the Director. At the request of the Director or on receipt of a petition signed by at least 1/2 of the full time faculty of the School, the School Committee to Evaluate the Director, plus the College senior faculty senator, shall design and carry out a confidential evaluation of the Director. Input will be solicited from the faculty of the School and as deemed appropriate, may include input from other College of University faculty and administrators as well as from relevant constituencies, e.g., members of professional advisory committees, members of professional associations, and students. The committee shall produce a written report for the Provost with a copy to the Director and the College Dean, and a summary report to the faculty. In the absence of either a request by the Director or a petition from the faculty, and in accord with UNLV Bylaws (Chapter III, section 14, subsection 14.3) and the University and System of Higher Education (chapter 5, section 5.11) this evaluation must be completed no less than once every 3 years.

Music: The faculty will evaluate the department chair annually, by means of a formal, anonymous evaluation instrument. Completed evaluations will be collected by the Dean's office. The Dean is responsible for communicating the evaluation information to the chair.

GREENSPUN COLLEGE OF URBAN AFFAIRS: (Standardized form for evaluations, Qualtrics)
2.13 A periodic assessment of College administrators by academic faculty and nonacademic faculty who report directly to the administrators will be held at least once every three years. An assessment of the
administrators’ performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency will be included. The unit head will be evaluated as provided by the Bylaws of the unit. Results of the evaluation will be made available to the Dean.

Communications:
The department personnel committee shall be responsible for developing and overseeing the process of evaluating the Chair of the Department.

Criminal Justice:
The Chair will be evaluated annually in accordance with guidelines provided by The Greenspun College of Urban Affairs.

Journalism and Media:
The Chair will be evaluated every 3 years, in conjunction with the Faculty's vote on whether to recommend reappointment of the Director under section 7.3 The director shall be evaluated based on performance of the responsibilities set forth in Sections 7.4.1 through 7.4.11. The school personnel committee shall prepare a summary of the Director's performance and present it to the faculty before the vote on whether to recommend reappointing the director.

Environmental and Public Affairs:
The Director shall be evaluated annually by the individual faculty members of the School. The confidential evaluations are submitted on a form designed and collected by the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee compiles and summarizes the evaluations and transmits them to the Director and Dean and makes them available to the full faculty. The report shall include the full text of all comments. The Director shall be evaluated based on performance of the responsibilities set forth in Sections 5.1.1 through 5.1.13.

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (Standardized form for evaluations, Qualtrics)
College of Liberal Arts Bylaws 3 March, 2009
Article II. Officers of the College
2.10 A periodic assessment of college administrators by academic faculty and nonacademic faculty who report directly to the administrators will be held at least once every three years. An assessment of the administrators’ performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency will be included.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCES: nothing in their unit bylaws on review of chairs (Qualtrics survey designed by Dean)

Chemistry: An evaluation report shall be made annually regarding the Department Chair. This report shall be made by a 3 member committee, chaired by a past Department Chair. The committee shall use an evaluation form with comments required. The report shall be discussed with the chair, who may submit comments which shall become a part of the report. The final report, after approval by the department, shall be sent to the dean, for use in compiling the annual evaluation of the Chair. This report shall be completed by March 15.

Geosciences: The performance of the department Chair shall be evaluated annually by the office of the College Dean, based on a College questionnaire distributed to all Department faculty.

Life Sciences:
The performance of the director will be evaluated each year through procedures established by the Dean's office.
Sample evaluations:

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Department Chair/Associate Deans Annual Review
(Evaluation period January 1 through December 31, 201..)

Department: 
Year: 201___

Annual Review (please indicate)
Chair □
Associate Dean Undergraduate Programs □
Associate Dean Research, Graduate Studies, and Computing □

DO NOT sign your name on this form.

Please indicate your role in the department by checking one of the following:
Full-time Faculty □
Professional Staff □

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the number which best corresponds with your chair/associate dean’s performance regarding the trait described. Comments may be placed in the space provided after each survey section. Some items may not be applicable to the responsibilities of some evaluators; in such cases, please circle NA.

5 = excellent
4 = good
3 = average
2 = below average
1 = unacceptable

NA = not applicable/insufficient data

Leadership

1. involves faculty in the determination of goals and methods of operation ........... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

2. effectively selects personnel (the right person for the right job) .........................5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA
3. provides leadership in curriculum development ................................................................. 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

4. establishes clear priorities .............................................................................................. 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

5. is aware of national issues and trends ............................................................................. 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

6. demonstrates knowledge of all programs/sub disciplines in department ........... 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

7. performs effectively and professionally under pressure ............................................ 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

8. effectively manages conflict and provides leadership in problem resolution ...... 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

Administration

9. conducts well organized and meaningful meetings ..................................................... 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

10. exhibits good time management skills (meets deadlines, responds promptly) .... 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

11. delegates authority as appropriate ............................................................................. 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

12. follows proper procedures in personnel management ............................................ 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

13. provides good supervision of classified and professional staff............................. 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

Fairness and Ethics

14. values differences and diversity in people ................................................................. 5 ....... 4 ........ 3 ........ 2
........ 1 ........ NA

15. treats colleagues and students in an ethical and professional manner ............... 5 ....... 4 ........ 3
........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

Communication
16. maintains good interpersonal relationships with other administrators ............... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

17. communicates in a tactful and skilled manner ...................................................... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

18. keeps the department well-informed................................................................. 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

19. consults with the department in decision-making ............................................. 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

20. is available/accessible to faculty and students..................................................... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

Program Development

21. effectively advocates for resources to achieve departmental goals .................. 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

22. develops long-range plans .................................................................................... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

Support and Evaluation

23. encourages and assists in the professional development of personnel .............. 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

24. fairly and regularly evaluates performance ......................................................... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

25. supports efforts to improve teaching/position effectiveness ................................ 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

26. supports efforts to improve scholarship research and/or creative activities ....... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

27. supports efforts to improve service/community engagement ........................... 5 ........ 4 ........ 3 ........ 2 ........ 1 ........ NA

Narrative Questions

If more space is required, feel free to add comments on a separate sheet of paper.

28. What are the department chair/associate dean’s greatest strengths?
29. In what areas would you like to see the chair/associate dean improve?

30. Comments

**Lee Business School:**

Each college/school is required to conduct a faculty review of department chairs as part of the chair's annual evaluation. This anonymous online chair evaluation will be used by Dean Hathaway as input to this evaluation. Please complete this evaluation to the best of your ability.

Thank you for your participation.

**Part I. - Required**

Please rate the performance of your department chair, Dr. XXX, for the 2017 year. Select "No Comment" if you lack sufficient information to make a rating.

1. Enhancing the reputation of the department within the school/University.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

2. Obtaining the resources needed by the department.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

3. Managing budget and resources effectively.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

4. Creating a climate that motivates faculty to be productive.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

5. Maintains a smoothly-working cooperative office staff.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

7. Successfully manages conflict within the department.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

8. Availability and accessibility to faculty.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment

9. Leadership in stimulating research and creative activities.
   Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor No Comment
10. Effectively incorporates faculty input into decision making.
   Excellent  Very Good  Good  Fair  Poor  No Comment

   Excellent  Very Good  Good  Fair  Poor  No Comment

12. All things considered, do you have confidence in the performance of the Department Chair?
   Yes  No

Part II. - Optional
For the next series of questions, please provide comments that will assist the Dean in evaluating
the performance of your department chair, Dr. XXX.

12. Areas of strength and specific examples of positive performance:

13. Specific suggestions for improvement:

14. Other general comments:

Technical Issues? Survey Questions? Contact Stoney Alder (702) 895-2052 / stoney.alder@unlv.edu
### Institutional comparative data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Campus wide</td>
<td>Five-year review process for admin personnel is defined, mainly the procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Detailed instrument is defined (mainly numeric rating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Campus wide</td>
<td>Policy for evaluating department chairs, heads of divisions, heads of schools, and academic directors. The policy specifies the process, procedure, methods, and outcome. Departments may use different forms of evaluation. The policy suggests both qualitative assessment and scales of evaluations be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>An online evaluation form is provided (mainly numeric rating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
<td>Campus wide</td>
<td>Evaluation Forms are available online by colleges and departments. Not standardized across units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Monterey Bay</td>
<td>Campus wide</td>
<td>Department Chair Appointment and Evaluation Policy is defined. Evaluation form is provided (mainly qualitative).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Gulf Coast University</td>
<td>Campus wide</td>
<td>Guidelines for distributing, collecting, and analyzing the results of the Chairs and Deans Survey Instrument Detailed instrument is defined (mainly numeric rating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Campus wide</td>
<td>High-level policy is defined (shall be formally reviewed at least every three-five years) but no guidelines specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>Campus wide</td>
<td>High-level policy is defined (shall be formally reviewed at least every five years) but no guidelines specified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>