

BLACK HILLS STATE UNIVERSITY
Policy and Procedure Manual

SUBJECT: Five Year Review of Administrator

NUMBER: 4:12

Office: Office of the President

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, assist in planning and decision-making, and help facilitate 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 and chairs at least every five years, using a standard process. Assistant or associate vice presidents and deans are typically not evaluated via this process. Those positions should be evaluated via the standard annual evaluation for their position. The results of the performance evaluation 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 the supervisor.

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 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 for the review. All input to the review will be confidential and only used by the RC for conducting the review and completing the report.
 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)

- i. The supervisor will determine and appoint the RC membership and the chair of the RC, ensuring appropriate representation from the campus community (e.g., faculty, staff, and students). The RC will consist of at least five members and shall be chaired by an individual from outside the school/department of the administrator being reviewed. The chair shall

hold an administrative position equal to the administrator being reviewed. Any faculty member who is asked to serve on the RC should already be tenured.

c. Charge of the Review Committee

- i. 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 an overview of the process, the timeline and to discuss the RC's charge.

d. Procedures Plan for the Review

- i. 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 (ex.: IDEA) of members of the school/department and input from students, if the school/department is academic. 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.

e. Self-Assessment

- i. A written self-evaluation from the administrator being reviewed will be an important element in the review procedures plan. If utilizing IDEA, the self-assessment will be conducted through them. 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 may also 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

- i. Faculty, Staff and Students: Input from the faculty and staff of the school/department 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.
- ii. Campus colleagues: Selected colleagues and peers in comparable positions on campus should be asked for input by the RC.
- iii. 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

- i. 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 to the school/department.

h. Methods for Collecting Input

- i. Data analyzed and synthesized for the review shall involve faculty and staff, students, peers and may include input from others, as determined by the RC. For example, surveys used may include the following or other similar survey:
 1. IDEA Impressions of Administrator, or other similar survey format
 2. IDEA Faculty, Staff, and/or Student Perceptions of Administrator

- ii. The IDEA surveys were suggested 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
 - i. The RC shall compile a written report on its review and submit the report including all supporting material 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:
 1. Executive Summary– provides a brief summary of the review committee, review process, and a summary of key findings of the review and its recommendations (no more than 2 pages)
 2. Review Process – outlines the Review Committee (RC), activities of the RC with timeline, and sources of data and input
 3. Data results, Interpretation and Key Findings
 4. Recommendations - the RC is asked to identify 2-3 recommendations based upon an analysis of the findings
 5. Appendices – survey instrument and results, summary of data collected in interviews and focus groups, and other materials
 - j. Communication with Administrator Being Evaluated
 - i. 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. The supervisor will provide a copy of the RC’s confidential report and all 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 School/Department

- i. After the conclusion of the review process, the supervising administrator will communicate with the faculty and staff of the school/department in writing, to report the outcome of the performance evaluation. The written communication of deans will be provided to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A confidential copy of the RC's report and supporting materials will also be provided to the University President. For vice presidents who are being reviewed, the written communication, report, and supporting materials will be provided directly to the University President. The RC's confidential review report and all supporting material will not be made available to anyone in or outside the school/department other than the supervisor of the supervising administrator.

1. General Timeline for the Five-Year Review Process

- i. September: 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.
- ii. September-October: RC develops a review plan which is shared with both the supervisor and the person under review.
- iii. October-November: The RC gathers and synthesizes information for the review.
- iv. January: RC finalizes review and prepares written report.
- v. February: RC conveys written report to supervising administrator.
- vi. 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.
- vii. March-April: The supervising administrator completes the process and communicates first with administrator being evaluated and then the school/department. The RC members remain confidential.

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: Revised by President Laurie Nichols on 06/16/2022.