1. Purpose

This policy and its procedures establish the protocols for the five-year performance evaluation of University administrators in order to assess administrative effectiveness, provide feedback to assist supervisors in their evaluation responsibilities, to assist in planning and decision-making, and to provide input into the evaluation of the administrator’s employment.

2. Policy

The Administrator review provides input into the systematic evaluation of the performance of individuals serving as vice presidents, college deans, unit directors, and department heads at least every five years, using a standard process. The review is designed for those individuals serving as the primary or lead of an office or unit. Assistant or associate to vice presidents, deans or department heads are typically not evaluated via this process. The results of the performance evaluation informed by 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 systematic performance evaluation and thus 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. Typically, the five-year performance evaluation will occur in the fall semester of the fifth full academic year following the first appointment of the individual to an administrative position and every fifth year thereafter.
      ii. The systematic performance evaluation and thus the review is the responsibility of the administrator to whom the person being evaluated reports. The review will be conducted by a Review Committee (RC) comprised of at least five but no more than nine members appointed by the supervising administrator. The written report compiled by the RC upon the completion of the review and all materials supporting the report will be provided only to the supervising administrator.
         1. A written self-assessment by the administrator being reviewed and information obtained through surveys, interviews and/or focus groups will be used by the RC as input to the review. All input to the review will be confidential and for the use of the RC in conducting the review and completing the report for the review.
         2. Prior to the review, a discussion on the process and the role, membership, and chair of the RC will occur between the administrator being reviewed and their supervisor. The administrator being evaluated
should be invited to provide input into the process. This discussion can include issues that should be explored and can provide a forum for an overall discussion of the review process and timeline. This meeting will take place before the selection and appointment of the RC and the RC chair.

b. The Review Committee (RC)
The supervisor will determine and appoint the RC membership and the chair of the RC, ensuring appropriate representation from the unit (e.g. faculty, NFE, civil service, students, etc.). The RC will consist of at least five but no more than nine members and shall be chaired by an individual from outside the unit of the administrator being reviewed. The chair shall hold an administrative position equal to the administrator being reviewed.

c. Charge of the Review Committee
The RC will be charged in writing by the supervising administrator when appointing each RC member. The supervising administrator will call the first meeting of the RC to provide overview of the process and timeline and discuss the RC’s charge.

d. Procedures Plan for the Review
The RC is responsible for developing a detailed procedures plan for the review and for determining the optimal methods for engaging participants in the review. The procedures shall include a confidential survey of members of the unit and input from students, if the unit is an academic unit. The plan for the review will be discussed with the supervising administrator and the administrator being reviewed as the plan is being developed and before the plan is approved by the supervising administrator. The approved plan will be shared with the administrator being reviewed. Although general guidelines and procedures are provided, it is expected that they will be customized and streamlined through interaction of the supervisor, the person being evaluated, and the chair of the RC. See Attachment 1 for a suggested timeline.

e. Self-Assessment
A written self-evaluation from the administrator being reviewed will be an important element in the review procedures plan. This self-assessment provides the RC with the perspective of the individual being reviewed on accomplishments and leadership effectiveness. The administrator being reviewed will be invited to meet with the RC at one of the committee’s initial meetings to discuss the self-evaluation. The chair of the RC also may hold an individual private meeting with the administrator being reviewed prior to the meeting with the RC to discuss the self-assessment, share perspectives and identify specific areas of interest for follow-up.

f. Input into the Review
Faculty, Staff and Students: 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.

Campus colleagues: Selected colleagues and peers in comparable positions on campus should be asked by the RC for input.

External 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 RC as well as input obtained by interviews, focus groups or other methods, when deemed appropriate by the RC and included in the procedures plan.

g. Confidentiality of Input into the Review
Confidentiality is critical and essential for the success of the review. All input shall be confidential and no individual or person contributing input shall be identified with the input they provide. Likewise, the results of the review are also confidential and shall only be shared with the supervisor in a written report. The supervisor will be responsible for communicating results back to the individual under review as well as the unit.

h. Methods for Collecting Input
Input to the review shall involve faculty and staff, students, peers and may include input from others, as determined by the RC. 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

The IDEA surveys were selected as they have established reliability and validity and provide national benchmark data. In addition, the survey is administered by the IDEA Center and assures complete confidentiality for those responding. Beyond these surveys, interview and focus group methods may be appropriate for peers, students and others, as determined by the RC.

i. Report of the Review
The RC shall compile a written report on its review and submit the report in a three-ring binder including all material supporting the report to the supervising administrator. The Chair of the RC should confer with the supervising administrator as the written report is developed. An outline for the report is:
   i. Executive Summary– provides a brief summary of the review committee, review process, summarizes key findings of the review and recommendations (no more than 2 pages).
   ii. Review Process – outlines the Review Committee (RC), activities of the RC with timeline, sources of data and input (e.g., survey, interviews, focus groups, etc.).
   iii. Data results, Interpretation and Key Findings
   iv. Recommendation(s)- the RC is asked to identify 2-3 recommendations based upon an analysis of the findings.
   v. Appendices – survey instrument and results, summary of data collected in interviews and focus groups, and other materials.

j. Communication with Administrator Being Evaluated
Within two weeks after the supervising administrator receives the report of the RC, the supervisor will meet with the individual under evaluation to discuss the review and the results of the performance evaluation of which the review was a part. The supervisor will provide at the meeting with the administrator a copy of the RC’s confidential report and all summary support materials collected and used in the review. The report and the materials will comply with the confidentiality requirement of the review. The supervisor also provides a concluding, summations letter to the person evaluated when the entire process is completed.
k. Communication with Unit
After the conclusion of the review process, the supervising administrator will communicate with the faculty and staff of the unit, in writing, reporting the outcome of the performance evaluation where the review was an important input.

The written communication will be copied to the supervisor of the supervising administrator and this copy shall transmit a confidential copy of the RC’s report of the review and supporting material. The RC’s confidential report on their review and its supporting material will not be made available to anyone in or outside the unit other than the supervisor of the supervising administrator.

l. General Timeline for the Five-Year Review Process
   October: Supervising Administrator meets with the person to be evaluated. Within 3 weeks after the meeting, the supervising administrator forms and charges RC to undertake the review as input into the performance evaluation.

   October-November: RC develops a review plan which is shared with both the supervisor and the person under review.

   November-December: The RC gathers and synthesizes information for the review.

   January: RC finalizes review and prepares written report.

   February: RC conveys written report to supervising administrator.

   March: Within 2 weeks after the submission of the report, the supervising administrator meets with the person being evaluated provides the RC’s report of the Review and communicates the results of the performance evaluation.

   March-April: The supervising administrator completes the process and communicates first with administrator being evaluated and then the unit.

4. Responsible Administrator

   The University President 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.