

**SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Policy and Procedure Manual**

SUBJECT: Five Year Leadership Review of Administrator

NUMBER: 4:2

---

1. Purpose

This policy and its procedures establish the protocols for the five-year review of University administrators in order to enhance their administrative effectiveness. In addition to annual performance reviews, conducting periodic developmental and evaluative leadership reviews of senior leaders are a means to support this commitment.

2. Policy

Administrator review is a systematic review of administrative effectiveness of individuals serving as vice presidents, assistant/associate vice presidents, college deans, unit and school directors, directors of units overseeing significant staff and resources, and academic department heads at least every five years, using a standard process. Upon request approved by the President, administrator reviews of other leaders and managers may be performed in accordance with this policy. The review is developmental in nature, and can incorporate a coaching component, the focus of which is determined by the review outcomes. The results of the review should be available no later than the middle of the spring semester of the fifth year of service and every following fifth year. A review may be conducted prior to the fifth year if requested by an administrator or if deemed appropriate by a supervising administrator.

3. Procedures

a. The Process

- i. The five-year leadership review occurs during the fall semester of the fifth full academic year following the first appointment of the individual being evaluated to an administrative position and every fifth year thereafter.
- ii. The review is the responsibility of the supervising administrator, or the person to whom the individual being reviewed reports. The supervisor will appoint a Review Committee and its Chair.
- iii. Prior to selection and appointment of the Review Committee and its Chair, a discussion of the process and the role, membership, and the candidates for Chair and the Review Committee will occur between the individual being reviewed and the supervising administrator. This discussion can include issues that should be explored and will provide a forum for an overall discussion of the review process and timeline.

b. The Review Committee

The supervising administrator will determine and appoint the Review Committee membership and the chair of the Review Committee, ensuring appropriate representation

from the division/college/school/department (e.g. faculty, NFE, civil service, students, etc.). The Review Committee will consist of at least five (5) but no more than nine (9) members and will be chaired by an individual from outside the division/college/school/department of the individual being reviewed. The Chair shall hold an administrative position equal to the individual being reviewed.

c. Charge of the Review Committee

The supervising administrator will call the first meeting of the Review Committee to provide an overview of the process and timeline and discuss the Review Committee's charge. The supervising administrator will provide the Committee's Charge in writing.

d. Plan for the Review

The Review Committee is responsible for developing a detailed plan for the review and for determining the optimal methods for engaging participants in the review.

- i. The plan must include a confidential survey of members of the division/college/school/department and input from students, if an academic unit. The plan shall also include the review of a written self-assessment by the individual being evaluated.
- ii. The plan for the review will be discussed with the supervising administrator and the individual being reviewed as the plan is being developed and before the plan is approved by the supervising administrator.
- iii. The approved plan will be shared with the individual being reviewed. Although general guidelines and procedures are provided, it is expected that the plan will be customized and streamlined through interaction of the supervising administrator, the individual being reviewed, and the Chair of the Review Committee.

e. Self-Assessment

A written self-assessment from the individual being reviewed will be an important element in the review plan. This self-assessment provides the Review Committee with the individual's perspective on their personal and team accomplishments and leadership effectiveness. The individual being reviewed will be invited to meet with the Review Committee at one of the committee's initial meetings to discuss the self-assessment.

f. Input into the Review

Input from the faculty and staff of the unit is very important. When appropriate, students should be included in the process, drawing input from the students most likely to have had significant engagement with the individual under review. Selected colleagues and peers in comparable positions on campus should also be asked by the Review Committee for input. When appropriate, perspectives from relevant external audiences, peers, and stakeholders may be useful. Written reports and other documents from external advisory groups or boards may be useful to the Review Committee as well as input obtained by interviews, focus groups or other methods, when deemed appropriate by the Review Committee and included in the plan.

g. Confidentiality of Input into the Review

Confidentiality is critical and essential for the success of the review. Unless required by law or policy, input shall be confidential and no individual or person contributing input shall be identified with the input they provide. Likewise, unless required by law or policy the results of the review are also confidential except that they shall be shared with the supervising administrator, the supervising administrator's supervisor, and the individual

being evaluated in a written report. The supervising administrator will be responsible for communicating results back to the individual being reviewed.

h. Methods for Collecting Input

The review shall involve input from faculty and staff, students, peers and may include input from others, as determined by the Review Committee. Suggested surveys are as follows:

- i. Sample of Stakeholder's Letter and Survey Questions;
- ii. IDEA Impressions of Administrator (Vice President, Dean, Director);
- iii. IDEA Faculty Perceptions of Department Head.

Beyond these surveys, interview and focus group methods may be appropriate for peers, students, and others, as determined by the Review Committee.

i. Report of the Review

The Review Committee will compile a written report of its review and submit the report, including material supporting the report, to the supervising administrator. An outline for the report is:

- i. Executive Summary—a brief summary of the review committee, review process, summarizes key findings of the review and recommendations (less than 2 pages);
- ii. Review Process – outlines the Review Committee, activities of the Review Committee with timeline, sources of data and input (e.g., survey, interviews, focus groups, etc.);
- iii. Data results, Interpretation and Key Findings;
- iv. Recommendation(s) – identification of two to three (2 to 3) recommendations based upon an analysis of the results; and
- v. Appendices – survey instrument and results, summary of data collected in interviews and focus groups, and other materials.

j. Communication After Review

Within two (2) weeks after the supervising administrator receives the report of the Review Committee, the supervising administrator will meet with the individual being reviewed to discuss the review and the results of the review. At the meeting, the supervising administrator will provide a copy of the review Committee's confidential report and all summary support materials collected and used in the review to the individual being evaluated. The supervisor will provide a concluding, summations letter to the person reviewed when the entire process is completed. The report and supporting materials will be made a part of the reviewed individual's personnel file by the supervising administrator. Due to state data privacy laws, the review and any summaries thereof may not be shared publicly or with the individual's division without written authorization from the individual reviewed.

k. Compliance

If any information is received relative to allegations of serious misconduct or illegal action, whether the source is identified or not, the supervising administrator is charged with determining what, if any, investigation is appropriate and following applicable policies and procedures.

1. General Timeline for the Five-Year Review Process

- October: Supervising Administrator meets with the individual being reviewed. Within three (3) weeks after the meeting, the supervising administrator forms and charges Review Committee to undertake the review as input into the performance evaluation.
- October-November: Review Committee develops a review plan which is shared with both the supervisor and the person under review.
- November-December: The Review Committee gathers and synthesizes information for the review.
- January: The Review Committee finalizes the review and prepares written report.
- February: The Review Committee conveys the written report to the supervising administrator.
- March: Within two (2) weeks after the submission of the report, the supervising administrator meets with the individual being evaluated, provides the Review Committee's report of the review, and communicates the results, as appropriate.
- March-April: The supervising administrator completes the process and communicates first with the individual being reviewed.

4. Responsible Administrator

The Vice President overseeing Human Resources or designee is responsible for annual and ad hoc review of this policy and annual review of procedures. The University President is responsible for annual approval.

SOURCE: Approved by President on 01/14/2014; Revised, approved by President on 9/17/2021.