

Implementation Guidelines for Administrative Reviews in Accordance with Board of Trustees Policy

Chancellor Approved: Spring 2009; amended: August 1, 2024

1. Guiding Principles

These procedures for the five-year review of academic administrative officers apply to all vice chancellors, academic deans (including the graduate dean), library directors, department chairs, and selected other leaders.

The purpose of the five-year review is formative. Specifically, the goals are to improve the performance of the leader and to identify areas of leadership development. The expected outcome is improved leadership for the enhancement of the institution, and the review may lead the appointing officer to initiate a more comprehensive summative review.

The five-year review is the responsibility of the appointing officer, who shall determine its conduct, processes, conclusions and necessary actions resulting from the review. The review should be a collaborative endeavor involving students, faculty, administration, and other campus constituencies, as appropriate. These constituencies vary considerably by position and by unit; therefore, the review process will vary accordingly.

The appropriate level of faculty involvement in evaluation should be determined by the nature of the administrative post (e.g., faculty input should be weighted more heavily in the evaluation of deans and department chairs than in the evaluation of positions above the level of dean).

2. Criteria for Evaluation of Administrators

The appointing officer will determine the expectations and demands of the position, and will also determine the criteria for the evaluation.

3. Timeframe

Subject to the chancellor's discretion, vice chancellors will undergo a comprehensive assessment as described in the policy during the third academic year of their appointment. Such reviews will follow the same review guidelines. Those reviewed will then begin the five-year comprehensive review cycle (i.e., unless the chancellor determines otherwise, the next regularly scheduled review is during the eighth academic year).

The appointing officer shall inform the internal constituencies of the need for a Review Committee by September 1 of the 5th year of the administrator's appointment and solicit names from the constituencies to be considered for the committee. The appointing officer will select the review committee of 3-7 members which will include, but not limited to, faculty from within the unit/constituency. The Committee will present its final report to the appointing officer by February 15 of that academic year.

4. Structure

The appointing officer will determine the process and guidelines for the review, following appropriate input from constituencies. Each process depends on the expectations of the position, input from constituencies and the needs of the institution.

5. Procedures

The Appointing Officer is responsible for determining the procedures to be followed in the review, consistent with the principles of openness, collaboration and shared governance. The appointing officer and the review committee also must ensure that all relevant constituencies have an

opportunity to offer input during the review. The entire process is collaborative among the appointing officer and members of the unit, including, for instance, faculty, associate/assistant deans, staff, and students. For the review of chairs/directors of schools/departments, faculty should constitute the majority of the committee.

Role of the Review Committee:

- Meet with the appointing officer to discuss the job expectations, goals, major constraints and specific areas pertinent to the review of the administrator's performance over the past 5 years. The appointing officer will provide advice about persons to consult and the expected timeline for the review.
- Meet with the administrator under review and receive the administrative portfolio. At this time the administrator under review may suggest additional persons or relevant data sources to consult and outline a communication process with the committee.
- Obtain faculty input through several methods, including, but not limited to, a survey, forum, or formal presentation. The survey instrument must be based on the evaluation criteria specified and affirmed by the appointing officer. The survey instrument will include a summative question about the overall effectiveness of the administrator.
- At the discretion of the appointing officer, provide an opportunity for the administrator under review to make a presentation to the constituency (faculty, staff, and students) based on the content of the administrative portfolio. The presentation may include: 1) leadership philosophy, strategies, and methodologies; 2) attempted innovations and assessment of their effectiveness; 3) statement of objectives for the future of the unit/constituency.
- Solicit additional comments from the constituencies.
- Gather other information as suggested by the appointing officer, the administrator under review or at its own discretion, including if appropriate reviews by professionals outside the unit/constituency. Confidentiality of the information provided to the committee will be maintained.

6. Report of Review

Before the final report is given to the appointing officer, a draft of the report will be given to the administrator under review. It is appropriate to invite the administrator under review for an informal discussion of the findings. He or she shall be invited to prepare a written response. If he or she should choose to do so then any such response should be included with the final written report. After meeting with the administrator under review, the Review Committee will provide its final report to the appointing officer.

The report should

- a. Describe the main premises governing the report.
- b. State the results of the survey instrument. The results will be analyzed as to the views of each group of faculty (tenured, tenured-track, fixed term).
- c. State what information was used, and the sources of this information in assessing performance in relation to the standards of evaluation.
- d. Provide a description of the strengths and the weaknesses of administrator, make suggestions for improvement, and recommend actions ranging from commendation to termination.

ADMINISTRATIVE PORTFOLIO

The administrative portfolio for the Review Committee may include the following documents and statements:

1. Documents

- a. updated CV
- b. unit strategic planning progress reports during the review period;
- c. annual reports for the unit during the review period;
- d. administrator's annual report during the review period;
- e. annual administrator evaluation survey results during the review period (if such surveys are conducted for the officer under review);
- f. annual personnel evaluations by the supervisor of the officer under review performed during the review period.

2. Statements

The administrative portfolio may include a reflective statement describing the officer under review.

- a. personal leadership development plan
- b. administrative and leadership philosophies, strategies, and methodologies;
- c. attempted innovations and assessment of their effectiveness;
- d. statement of objectives for the future of the administrative unit;
- e. written summary statement prepared by the officer under review that documents his or her performance during the review period. The summary statement shall address the evaluation standards.