



GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS DIRECTORS -

Overview

In accordance with University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy 1.16-4, a review of directors who report directly to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost and directors who report to a vice president who reports to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost will be undertaken every five years.

The five-year review is an evaluation of the director's leadership and administrative performance and is not an evaluation of the unit(s) they oversee. Support unit reviews are conducted independently of the director's five-year review. In addition, all faculty, including academic administrators, are reviewed annually in accordance with UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.06-1, *Written Annual Evaluation Policy*. The reporting vice president's annual performance evaluation of each director includes administrative and programmatic assessments as well as relevant criteria related to traditional faculty activities that align with the responsibilities of the administrator's position.

Administrator Review Committee

The appropriate vice president will form a review committee composed of five to seven members, from the unit as well as other areas of the University directly affected by the unit. The review committee will be chaired by a person from outside of the unit of the director who is under review.

Administrator Review Process

1. Director Self-Assessment

The first step in the director's five-year review is the submission of a self-assessment report to the vice president. The self-assessment should briefly describe the following:

- the director's responsibilities;
- the director's accomplishments during the previous five years, including how the director has advanced the teaching, student success, research/scholarship, and service goals of the unit;
- to the extent the director maintains active instruction, research, or professional service efforts, including involvement in student success activities in any of the assigned areas of effort, as appropriate (reference applicable PTU or other discipline-specific performance criteria or standards), provide the percent allocation of effort in the department/discipline and outline accomplishments during the previous five years submitting supporting documentation, as applicable (e.g., student end of course experience surveys, peer evaluation of teaching, scholarly productivity outputs or metrics, assessments, etc.);
- the director's goals for the future advancement of the unit;
- any foreseeable challenges for the unit in the next five years; and
- a list of individuals (not to exceed ten) who are familiar with his/her work as director.



The self-assessment should not exceed six pages in length and will form the initial working document for the committee.

2. Administrator Review Committee

The review committee is responsible for reviewing the director's self-assessment, providing the director's constituencies the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the director's leadership of the unit, and preparing a report to the vice president that reflects a 360° evaluation (i.e., feedback from all the constituencies with whom the director interacts) of the director's overall performance.

3. Constituency Feedback

To solicit feedback on the director's leadership from the unit's faculty, staff, students, college/school administrators, and other constituencies, the review committee may utilize one or more of the following:

- Confidential standardized questionnaires developed for evaluation of the director's leadership
- Standardized letters and memos to request input from administrators of other campus units, members of the college or school's external boards, and leaders of relevant professional organizations
- Individual and/or group interview forums with the director's direct reports, faculty, staff, and students

Other constituencies that may be solicited for feedback during the review process include administrators of other campus units, members of the unit's advisory board, and leaders of relevant professional organizations.

The committee is expected to give equal consideration to each group of constituencies (all faculty and staff ranks and representatives from all constituencies with which the director interacts) when soliciting input for the review and writing the final committee report.

4. Administrator Review Committee Report

The committee will prepare a report that addresses two primary questions:

- What are the most significant accomplishments over the past five years related to the director's leadership of the unit?
- What recommendations could be offered to the director to improve the administration of the unit?

The review committee report will be submitted to the vice president. If needed, the committee chair will meet with the vice president to review and clarify points in the report.

Report on Activity in Teaching, Research, and Professional Service (if applicable)

If the administrator maintains active instruction, research, or professional service allocation of effort in a unit, a report that aligns with existing departmental faculty review expectations will be added to the review team report as an appendix.



5. Review Follow-Up

The vice president will provide the director with a copy of the report and schedule a meeting with the director to discuss the report. During the meeting, the director and vice president will determine goals and objectives based on the results of the report.