



ACADEMIC AFFAIRS GUIDELINES

Section 2.7	Academic Administrators and Faculty	
Title:	Department Chair & Dean Evaluation Guidelines	
Number (Current Format)	Number (Prior Format)	Date Last Revised
2.7.1.A	10.4	11/2018
Reference:		
Related Form(s):		

1. Purpose

These guidelines establish the protocols for the five-year performance evaluation of academic administrators, which may include unit chairs/deans or vice-presidents responsible for direct supervision and evaluation of faculty/staff in the Regental system. The purpose of this performance evaluation is to assist in providing feedback regarding administrative effectiveness, to assist in future planning and decision-making, and to provide input to enhance and improve performance. The intent is to encourage positive interactions within the academic units for the betterment of the university. The Administrator review provides input into the systematic evaluation at least every five years, using a standard process. A systematic performance review may be conducted prior to the fifth year if requested by an administrator or if deemed appropriate by a supervising administrator.

2. Procedures

- 2.1. 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 the unit administrative position and every fifth year thereafter.
- 2.2. The systematic performance evaluation and thus the review is the responsibility of the administrator to whom the person being evaluated reports (dean or provost).
- 2.3. The written report compiled by the supervisor upon the completion of the review and all materials supporting the report will be provided only to the administrator being reviewed, to the provost, and to the president.
- 2.4. Prior to the review, a discussion on the process and details of the review will occur between the administrator being reviewed and the supervisor. This discussion can include issues that should be explored and can provide a forum for an overall discussion of the review process and timeline. The supervisor may consult members of the academic unit to obtain a sense of what is important to faculty within the unit. The supervisor is responsible for determining the optimal methods for engaging participants in the review. In some situations, supervisors may form a Review Committee to coordinate the review process.

3. Data Collection

- 3.1.** A written self-assessment by the administrator being reviewed and information obtained through surveys, interviews and any other agreed-to-resources will be used by the supervisor as input to the review.
- 3.2.** A written self-evaluation from the administrator being reviewed will be an important element in the review procedures plan. This self-assessment provides the supervisor with the perspective of the individual being reviewed on accomplishments and leadership effectiveness.

3.3. Staff Input

- 3.3.1.** Input from the faculty and staff of the unit shall be included, and when appropriate, students should be included in the process.
- 3.3.2.** Selected colleagues and peers in comparable positions on campus should be asked by the supervisor for input. Feedback from directors in support units may also be included as appropriate. Inclusion of campus colleagues with knowledge of the unit may be especially relevant in smaller academic units (e.g., less than five faculty members) to provide a reasonable basis for feedback.
- 3.3.3.** 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 supervisor as well as input obtained by interviews, focus groups or other methods, when deemed appropriate.

3.4. Confidentiality

- 3.4.1.** All input shall be confidential and no individual or person contributing input shall be identified with the input they provide.
- 3.4.2.** The results of the review 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.

4. Formal Evaluation

4.1. Final Report

- 4.1.1.** The supervisor shall compile a written report on his/her review.
- 4.1.2.** Generally, the report will consist of the following sections:
- 4.1.2.1.** Executive Summary– provides a brief summary of the review committee, review process, summarizes key findings of the review and recommendations.
- 4.1.2.2.** Review Process – outlines the timeline, sources of data and input (e.g., survey, interviews, focus groups, etc.).
- 4.1.2.3.** Data results, Interpretation and Key Findings
- 4.1.2.4.** Recommendation(s) – the supervisor is asked to identify 2-3 recommendations based upon an analysis of the findings.
- 4.1.2.5.** Appendices – survey instrument and results, summary of data collected in interviews and focus groups, and other materials.

4.2. Formal Communication

- 4.2.1.** Once the review is completed 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 report and all summary support materials collected and used in the review.

- 4.2.2. 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 report its supporting material will not be made available to anyone in or outside the unit other than the provost and the president.

SOURCE:

AAC May 2017; AAC November 2018.

Appendix A
General Timeline for the Five-Year Review Process

- November-December: Supervising Administrator meets with the person to be evaluated to develop the review plan.
- December- February: The supervisor gathers and synthesizes information for the review.
- March-April: The supervising administrator completes the process and communicates first with administrator being evaluated and then the unit, the provost and president.