

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF ORU/CENTER DIRECTORS

The purpose of the review of an ORU/Center director is to evaluate his or her performance as an administrator and academic leader. This review is distinct from an academic review of the individual. It should also be distinct from a review of the ORU/Center as a whole, except as its accomplishments and program reflects the director's leadership.

The Stewardship Review Committee (SRC) is charged with evaluating the director's stewardship and with making a recommendation concerning his or her continued service as a director.

The deliberations and recommendations of the Stewardship Review Committee are strictly confidential. The chair of the Committee should remind all people interviewed of the confidential nature of the meeting.

The Stewardship Review Committee must interview the Director at the beginning and at the end of the interview process. The SRC must also interview the School Dean and Vice/Associate Dean for Administration and Finance. It is recommended that the SRC consider interviewing the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach and the Director of the UCSF Faculty Mentoring Program. The Committee should conduct additional interviews with individuals such as:

- Chairs or directors from the school
- Faculty members from the ORU/Center
- Other academic appointees and staff from the ORU/Center
- Students, housestaff and postdoctoral scholars from the ORU/Center, as appropriate
- Chiefs of service, school and hospital administrators
- Others, as appropriate

GUIDELINES FOR STEWARDSHIP REVIEW REPORTS

Overview--how many meetings of Committee, how ORU/Center was sampled, how many surveys and/ or responses received, etc.

Historical Perspective--if a first review, how did the transition to this Director happen; if the candidate was reviewed previously, summarize the last review

Education Program Leadership

Strengths and Opportunities

Research Program Leadership

Strengths and Opportunities

Faculty Development

- Recruitment
- Retention
- Advancement
- Mentorship
e.g., ability to provide effective assistance to junior members of the faculty in their continuing growth as teachers and scholars

Administrative Performance

- Vision/Mission/Strategic Planning
- Finances
e.g., wise and effective interactions with ORU/Center faculty, administrative committees, and the Dean to advance the full scope of responsibilities in matters such as budget management, fund raising, support funds, and FTE's
- Diversity
e.g., implementation of an effective affirmative action program and promotion of diversity and equal opportunity efforts in program administration and personnel practices
- Communication
e.g., effectiveness in interactions with faculty, staff, students/trainees, and other administrators to advance a cooperative spirit
- Decision-making/flexibility/adaptability
e.g., wise and effective conduct with faculty, administrative committees, and the Dean to advance the full scope of responsibilities in matters such as curriculum and space; effective contributions to the growth and development of the ORU/Center in ways that take account of current needs in education, research, and patient care
- Interpersonal relations/Conflict resolution
e.g., wise and effective interactions with members of the faculty and staff in administrative decisions relating to allocations of funds, space, research and teaching assignment
- Influence on Morale
e.g., demonstrated ability to effectively handle interpersonal relations among the faculty and staff and to make positive contributions to their morale and spirit
- Other Leadership Traits
e.g., effective and fair application of the policies of the University of California and UCSF

Relationships with the Campus and the Community

e.g., effective representation of the ORU/Center at campus, national and international levels

Clinical Program Leadership (if applicable)

Strengths and Opportunities

Conclusions and Recommendations

(NOTE: This section of the report will be presented at the ORU/Center meeting.)

- Overall Strengths and Opportunities
- Recommendations for Improvement
- Interim Review Items
Are there areas of improvement which the SRC feels should be updated or addressed prior to the next stewardship review?
- Summary
Which of the following options would you recommend?
 - 5 year renewal, no restrictions
 - 5 year renewal, interim report due at 3 years
 - 3 year renewal, full report due at 3 years
 - Non-renewal