

OVERVIEW OF THE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Five-year reviews of heads, directors, deans, vice presidents, and other administrators provide an opportunity to gather broad input on long-term contributions. While five-year reviews are generally distinct from academic program reviews, five-year reviews will consider the progress of the unit on specified benchmarks. Five-year reviews are guided by a set of administrative expectations to help standardize the review process and enable it to be used in coaching and follow-up assessments. Five-year reviews will include substantive input from faculty, staff, students, and external groups where appropriate.

As detailed in chapter five of UHAP, administrators are evaluated in annual and five year reviews on their leadership in developing collaborations and managing resources to build capacity, improve performance and advance innovation using the following administrative expectations:

1. **Leadership skills**, including vision, integrity, respect, and decisiveness;
2. **Partnership skills** involved in building internal and external relationships;
3. **Management skills** involved in acquiring and managing resources; and
4. **Capacity building skills**, including providing feedback, sustaining diversity and inclusion, and supporting staff and faculty development.
5. **Innovation skills**, especially progress in instruction, research, and service, as appropriate.

Common Elements of the Five-year Review Process

- Reviews must be scheduled every five years for any administrator continuing in an appointment.
- Review committees must be formed following the University' Shared Governance provisions:
When an academic department head is to be reviewed, the general faculty of the department will elect four faculty members to serve on the review committee, including at least one faculty member from outside the unit. The dean has the discretion to appoint up to two additional general faculty members from the department involved or elsewhere and to appoint others from the following groups: students, classified staff, and professionals or community representatives.
- Administrators should be given thirty days to compose their self-assessments and supporting documentation, which should be discussed with the review committee at the beginning of the process.
- Faculty, staff, and students in the unit and elsewhere, as appropriate, should be provided with opportunities to offer input that should be treated as confidential whenever possible.
- A confidentiality agreement should be signed by all members of committees.
- To avoid bias, a standard format should be used for meetings with the administrator, open forums, and surveys, though questions may be modified to address the distinctive elements of the unit.
- Administrators should meet with review committees at the ending of the process before the final report is completed to be given an opportunity to respond to any concerns that have emerged in the process.
- The supervising administrator should meet with the administrator to discuss the report.
- The administrator being reviewed should be given an opportunity to submit a written response to the report.
- The report should not be circulated, but an open forum should be held. The supervising administrator chairs that forum, and the administrator being reviewed should discuss the input that was submitted and the ways it will be translated into practice to move the unit forward.
- A short written summary of that discussion should be circulated to the faculty and staff in the unit.
- A copy of the final report, the administrator's response, and the summary document should be submitted to the supervising administrator's supervisor and Provost.