

North Dakota State University

Policy Manual

SECTION 327

EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

SOURCE: NDSU President
Faculty Senate

1. Introduction

North Dakota State University believes every university employee deserves regular evaluation of their professional duties as they relate to a formal job description and the university's needs. This process should be transparent and constructive, including an acknowledgment of the employee's achievements, as well as an assessment of their ability to match the university's expectations.

This policy pertains to the provost, full-time vice provosts, academic vice presidents who report to the provost, academic deans, full-time academic associate and assistant deans, directors of academic offices, and chairs and heads. The evaluation process will include input from a variety of groups; faculty will play a major role in evaluation of academic administrators.

2. Annual Review

Each administrator covered by this policy will be reviewed annually by the administrative supervisor to whom that person reports in accordance with Policy 167. Supervisors shall solicit feedback from all relevant stakeholders (including, but not limited to, faculty and staff who interact with the administrator) as a part of the annual review process. Feedback shall be collected through a consistent means, such as letters, interviews or surveys.

3. Comprehensive Review

All administrators covered under this policy will undergo comprehensive review. The first comprehensive review will be completed by the end of the administrator's third year of appointment. Subsequent reviews will occur every five years, to be completed by the end of the fifth year after the prior review. Interim reviews may be initiated by the administrator or by the person to whom the administrator reports. If a review indicates substantial areas of concern or lack of performance, the next comprehensive review will be completed within two years of that review.

4. Common Review Criteria

Review criteria will be based on the administrator's job description and may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a) leadership, strategic planning and assessment;
- b) administration and management;
- c) commitment to institutional values including equity and diversity, academic freedom, and shared governance;
- d) external relations;

e) service to the broad mission of the University.

The relative importance of evaluation areas will vary with administrator job description; therefore, some criteria above many not apply and others may be added.

5. Procedures

Comprehensive reviews will be initiated by the administrator's supervisor and must be conducted according to the procedures dictated by the specific unit and/or College. Each College should post their specific procedures on their College website. The [Comprehensive Review Procedures for Academic Administrators](#) are to be used for the evaluation of Deans, Vice Provosts, Academic Vice Presidents, and the Provost.

Review committees – consisting of tenured faculty, relevant administrators, and staff – will be formed in accordance with the Comprehensive Review Procedures. The review committee shall prepare a report summarizing its findings for submission to the supervisor. The supervisor shall be responsible for assembling a review committee to collect and summarize feedback from stakeholders. The supervisor shall solicit feedback on the committee's composition from the administrator under review. The composition of the committee should reflect the diversity of stakeholders with whom the administrator being reviewed interacts, as well as diversity based on gender and other protected factors. Individuals with a conflict of interest are ineligible to serve on the review committee. Conflicts of interest exist if there is a past or current relationship that compromises, or could have the appearance of compromising, a faculty member's judgment with regard to the candidate. The following list, while not exhaustive, illustrates the types of relationships that constitute a conflict of interest:

- A family relationship
- A marital, life partner or dating/romantic/intimate relationship
- An advising relationship (e.g., having served as the administrator's PhD or postdoctoral advisor)
- A direct financial interest and/or relationship
- Any other relationship that would prevent a sound, unbiased decision

The review committee shall prepare a report summarizing its findings for submission to the supervisor. Prior to the committee disseminating the report's findings, the administrator being reviewed will have an opportunity to respond to the summary report in writing. The administrator has 14 days to respond to the report, which will be submitted to the administrator's supervisor and the review committee.

Within 60 days of the submission of the report, the supervisor shall attend an open forum or faculty meeting and provide a verbal summary of the review. Copies of the summary report and the administrator's response will not be posted on publicly available (i.e., non-password protected) websites.

HISTORY:

New	July 1990
Amended	April 1992
Amended	January 1995
Amended	January 1996
Amended	February 1997
Amended	May 1997

Amended	January 2003
Amended	October 2007
Housekeeping	February 14, 2011
Housekeeping	July 12, 2013
Amended	January 9, 2017
Housekeeping	May 10, 2021
Amended	July 26, 2021