



FIVE-YEAR ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW PROCESS GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Faculty Affairs

Office of the Provost



Faculty Affairs

Mission



Our mission in Faculty Affairs is to cultivate and connect institutional structures for faculty advancement across the career lifespan in alignment with the overarching mission and role of the University of Arizona. We take an ecosystem equity approach across all system levels that considers (1) recruitment, (2) professional advancement, (3) retention, and (4) policies. Our work is grounded in an affirming, transparent, and inclusive approach to supporting faculty. You can find more details and information on each key area of our work:

- [Equity](#)
- [Recruitment](#)
- [Professional Advancement](#)
- [Retention](#)

Vision



We aspire to maintain high levels of accountability, efficiency, and transparency in all areas of faculty affairs. We adhere to the fundamental values of our land grant institution and R1 status. We believe that a humanistic approach to faculty activity will foster excellence, equity, and impact. We aim to promote understanding of the role and contributions of faculty in teaching, research, service, extension, creative activity, and clinical work.

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Chapter 5 Administrators

These guidelines are designed to accompany the five-year review process for administrative personnel who are part of University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP) [Chapter 5.3](#). We describe here the process and criteria for five-year reviews of department heads, school directors, deans, vice provosts, and vice presidents, including senior vice provosts and senior vice presidents, and other administrators as that term is defined in [ABOR PM 6.101.B.3a](#)¹. Such reviews follow a more comprehensive process for performance assessment than annual performance reviews in order to provide an opportunity to assess long-range goals and objectives.

The five-year review process is initiated after an administrator has successfully completed five-years of service in their position. The President, Provost, or appropriate senior vice president will initiate this review of deans and vice presidents. Deans will initiate this review for heads and directors. A five-year review is not required or anticipated if an administrator will not be renewed in accordance with the process outlined in [UHAP Section 5.4](#).

Purpose and Goal

The purpose of the five-year review is to assist with the development of administrative personnel through a process of reflection, assessment, recommendations, refining of future vision, and next action steps. As such, this review provides an opportunity for balanced input, transparency of evaluation, and accountability. ***The five-year review allows for a review of long-range goals and objectives, as well as a process for setting future-oriented goals for the next five years.*** The primary focus is on the leadership skills of the administrator in the development and evolution of the unit. The University of Arizona is committed to cultivating great leaders and supporting their professional growth and improvement. This process includes clearly laid out shared governance processes for assessment, input, and recommendations.

University Handbook of Appointed Personnel Policy

The five-year review evaluates administrators on their leadership in developing collaborations and managing resources to build capacity and advance innovation based upon criteria established by the University, feedback from the administrator's supervisor, and input from those with whom the administrator works. Five-year reviews will include input from relevant stakeholders, which may include faculty, staff, students, and external groups where appropriate. For a full description of the **UHAP 5.3 policy on five-year reviews go to:**

<http://policy.arizona.edu/employmenthuman-resources/five-year-reviews-administrative-personnel>

Five-year reviews provide an opportunity to gather broad input on long-term contributions, future goals and are guided by a set of key metrics for administrative expectations to help standardize the review process.

The five key metrics for review are as listed here:

¹ "Administrator" or "administrative" shall mean an officer who reports directly to the president or to a vice president and who is responsible for planning, organizing, directing controlling and evaluating the activities of a major segment of a university; promulgating and implementing university rules and regulations; preparing and administering the organizational budget; maintaining relationships with administrative officials and members of business, government and civic communities. These positions shall include **vice presidents, deans, academic department heads** and other positions as determined by the board.

<https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-101-Conditions%20of%20Administrative%20Service.pdf>.

1. **Building trust** by communicating a guiding vision, operating in an ethical manner, being accessible and responsive, maintaining composure, accountability, and acknowledging the lessons to be learned from missteps;
2. **Fostering collaboration** by effectively managing conflicts, forging partnerships both internal and external to the university setting, as well as advancing shared purposes in a manner that includes diverse perspectives in collaborative decision making;
3. **Maximizing resources** by recruiting and retaining high quality coworkers, helping them develop through coaching and assessment, improving operational effectiveness, and advancing data-based planning;
4. **Achieving results** by identifying opportunities, challenging received assumptions, taking strategic risks, and advancing innovations in a decisive and strategic manner that is attuned to the priorities of the unit and university;
5. **Inclusive excellence** by building community, advancing diversity and inclusion by improving climate, responding to bias, and soliciting/supporting diverse perspectives and experiences.

Arizona Board of Regents Administrator Review Policy

The Purpose of the Reviews of Administrators according to ABOR 6-108 is listed here in its entirety as indicated in ABOR policy:

The administrative staff performance evaluation procedure should pursue the following objectives:

1. To involve administrative staff in the formulation of objectives and goals related to their departments or divisions and their own personal and professional growth.
2. To assess actual performance and accomplishments in the areas of each employee's responsibility to include a reference to the accomplishment of affirmative action objectives.
3. To promote the effectiveness of administrative staff through articulation of the types of contributions they might make to the university community that will lead to greater personal and professional growth, recognition and rewards.
4. To provide a written record of administrative staff performance to support personnel decisions such as reappointment, merit increases, transfers and reassignment.
5. To recognize special talents, capabilities and achievements of administrative staff.

Overview of Steps, Roles and Timeline of the Five-year Administrator Review Process		
Step	Responsible Party	Timeline
1. Written Notice of Administrator Review A. Meet with Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to discuss process.	1. Administrator's Supervisor A. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs	Beginning of 6 th year of service
2. Administrator Self-study (see Page 6).	2. Administrator	30 days after written notice
3. Charge Review Committee & Provide Self-study.	3. Administrator's Supervisor	Beginning of semester of review
4. Review Committee meets with Administrator to gather additional information.	4. Chair and Review Committee	Within three weeks of receiving charge
5. A. 5-Year Administrator Review Survey is distributed to faculty, staff, students, collaborators, and other stakeholders. B. This assessment is accompanied by a communication indicating the committee is also available to meet with individuals or small groups upon request.	5. A. Administrator Review Assessment: B. Chair and Review Committee	Within 60 days of receiving the charge
6. Review Committee completes a report (see page 10) that includes Administrative Assessment and summary of meetings.	6. Chair Submits to Administrator's Supervisor	Within 120 days of charge
7. Supervisor meets with review committee and may gather additional information.	7. Administrator's Supervisor	Within 30 days of receiving Review Committee report
8. A. Final report is given to the Administrator. B. Administrator meets with Leadership Coaches to review & identify lessons learned. C. Administrator meets with Supervisor.	8. Responsible party for each section A. Administrator's Supervisor B. Administrator C. Administrator's Supervisor	Within 30 days of receiving the Review Committee's report
9. Supervisor and Chair of the Review Committee will submit a brief memo with a description of the process and key findings from the report to stakeholders.	9. Administrator's Supervisor, Chair of the Review Committee, Administrator	Before the end of the semester of review
10. Administrator publicly discusses the results of the review with personnel in the unit, and appropriate stakeholders.	10. Administrator	Before the end of the semester of review

Guidelines for the Administrator Under Review

Self-Study Guidelines for Administrators

Administrators will provide **their own** self-study which is an opportunity to explain both your broad responsibilities as well as the on-the-ground activities and how you work with the groups who will offer you feedback. Your Self-study will be shared with the review committee only; it is not a public document. Administrator can meet with their Supervisor at this early stage to discuss which key stakeholders should be represented on the committee and if there are any individuals who should not be included on the committee due to conflicts of interest. Organizational charts and other documents may be attached to the Self-study as appendices. ***The self-study should be no more than 6 pages (single spaced), not including appendices.***

A self-study should include the following four (4) sections:

- A. One-page single spaced bulleted summary of your five-year goals. This page may also include the mission of your unit, your administrator responsibilities, and your top 3-5 accomplishments in the past five-years. ***This document will be shared publicly and will be used as a cover page for Leadership assessment survey.***
- B. Provide a brief overview of the structure and mission of your unit to help understand by way of explaining the extent of your responsibilities. How has your unit's mission, culture, and productivity evolved over your tenure?
- C. Describe your work in each of the following areas by providing specific examples and metrics to show change over time (where available):
 1. **Building Trust:** How have you built trust across your unit? Examples may include specific steps you have taken in communicating a guiding vision, operating in an ethical manner, being accessible and responsive, maintaining composure, and acknowledging lessons learned.
 2. **Fostering Collaborations:** What have you done to foster collaborations internal and external to your unit?
 3. **Maximizing Resources:** How have you maximized resources for your unit, this may include but is not limited to the following examples: recruiting/retaining high quality coworkers, helping faculty or staff develop through coaching and assessment, improving operational effectiveness, and advancing data-based planning?
 4. **Achieving Results:** What have been your primary goals for your unit and how have you achieved results in those areas? Examples might include identifying opportunities, taking strategic risks, and advancing innovations in a decisive and strategic manner that is attuned to the priorities of the unit and university.
 5. **Instilling Inclusive Excellence:** How has your unit's culture developed under your leadership? What have you done to build civility, expand the diverse representation, and improve equity for salary and access to opportunity for faculty, staff and students?
- D. Summarize the lessons you have learned as a leader and set out your strategic plans for your own continuing development as a leader and how it connects with the next phase of your unit.

Meeting with the Committee

The administrator will meet with the review committee to answer questions or elaborate on their self-study. A goal for this meeting is also to identify relevant key stakeholders to contact for input during this process. Please see the appendix for suggested questions to guide the meeting with the review committee; the committee does not need to ask all of the questions. The administrator will prepare a 5-10 minute verbal summary of their self-study at the beginning of the meeting. The administrator will have reflected on the questions prior to the meeting, but will not have prepared scripted answers. The meeting will be an informal dialogue for the committee to ask clarifying questions and the administrator may also ask any questions they may have about the process. This meeting should last no more than 1 hour. The Chair of the Review Committee will facilitate the meeting and maintain the time limit.

Administrator Meeting with Internal Leadership Coach

The administrator will initiate meeting with a University of Arizona Internal Leadership Coach from the [Office of Leadership and Organizational Development](#) to review the final report from the Supervisor. During this meeting the coach will assist the administrator in understanding the results and help them draft a short list of lessons learned and future directions based on the report. In addition, they will discuss next steps for communicating their learning and plan with stakeholders.

Meeting with Supervisor

The goal of meeting with the supervisor is to discuss achievements, lessons learned and future plans. This meeting will also address any need for disciplinary action or follow up based on information discerned from the review process. The meeting with the supervisor will help critically assess issues and strengths.

Communicating Lessons Learned and Future Vision

There is flexibility for the administrator and their supervisor to choose the best strategies to share the lessons learned and future vision from the five-year review with stakeholders. This may be done in smaller groups, e.g. faculty meetings, department head meetings, or staff meetings. In any of these settings the administrator will share their lessons learned and their strategy moving forward with the unit. They will solicit input on their future vision and strategy moving forward as leader of their unit.

Guidelines for Committee Chair

Key roles of the chair in administering the review are to A) set the context for the review B) focus on the goal of the review to identify lessons learned and plan for development moving forward C) Interpreting the findings and the committee's report D) publicly sharing key findings of the report and plan for next steps.

Review Committee

The review committee is initiated and charged by the Administrator's Supervisor. As discussed in [UHAP 5.3.02](#), committees should include representatives from the groups who work with the administrator. Committees should be formed following the [Faculty Senate's Guidelines for Shared Governance](#), which specify that half of the committee should be *chosen by direct election by the faculty or a faculty elected body, appointed by an elected faculty officer, or appointed by an administrator from a list of several nominated by the Committee on Committees*. At least one of the faculty representatives should come from outside the administrators' unit. Committees should include members from diverse backgrounds and varied ranks. All members of the general faculty are eligible to serve, including career-track faculty in nontenure-eligible positions who have served for three of the last four years. Committees should include representation from staff, students, and external groups—if the administrator works with students and external groups.

Conflict of Interest: Committee members or administrators who have coauthored substantial publications or grants with a candidate must recuse themselves to avoid raising concerns about their impartiality. Deans and delegated Associate Deans can appoint a surrogate outside of the department to conduct the review to mitigate any issues of mentoring, internal collaborations, or questions of maintaining a balanced review process. In choosing committee members, conflict of interest should be considered.

If an administrator (A) under review has previously served as the chair or member of another administrator's (B) review committee, the latter administrator (B) cannot serve on the review committee for administrator (A), due to potential reciprocating evaluations and other COI issues.

Review Committee Process: Supervising administrators should meet with the review committee to launch the process. Before that meeting, the committee should be provided with the **self-study** of the administrator so that committee members can ask questions about the scope of duties and the organization of the unit. The link to access the policy and [Five-Year Administrator Review Guidelines](#) should also be provided on the Faculty Affairs website. The committee should be reminded that the purpose of the review is to provide leadership development for the administrator and to set goals for the next several years. The five-year review is not designed to be a tool for non-renewal. The committee should be directed to consider its primary purpose as providing constructive feedback that will enable the administrator to improve their performance. Committee members are advised that deliberations and input they receive are strictly confidential because the review is a confidential personnel process. Committee deliberations are shared directly with the administrator, and any individual comments are **not** attributed to specific members. All participants in the review process are reminded of the University of Arizona [policy against retaliation](#). All committees should sign the confidentiality agreement that is [available on line](#).

Review committees often find it useful to begin by focusing on gathering and interpreting feedback rather than on evaluating candidates' strengths and weaknesses because it is important to openly consider multiple perspectives rather than to seek to verify prior judgments. Some committee members may come to the discussions with strong opinions on the administrator being reviewed. Once those assessments have been aired, committee members should consciously step back from their own perspectives and focus on the process of gathering input. To help ensure that input is interpreted from multiple viewpoints, at least two committee members should meet with any individual or group who wishes to offer assessments. Committee members should obtain available training for implicit bias and equity before

beginning the review process. They should remain vigilant to reduce any bias in their own review and also in the interpretation of feedback from constituents.

Administrator Meeting with the Committee

The administrator will meet with the review committee to answer questions or elaborate on their self-study. A goal for this meeting is also to identify relevant key stakeholders to contact for input during this process. Please see the Appendix A for suggested questions to guide the meeting with the review committee; the committee does not need to ask all of the questions. The administrator will prepare a 10 minute summary of their self-study at the beginning of the meeting. They should have reflected on the Appendix A questions prior to the meeting, but not prepared scripted answers; instead, the meeting should be an informal dialogue with the committee. This process is designed for the committee to ask clarifying questions and the administrator may also ask any questions they might have of the committee or about the process. This meeting should last no more than 1 hour. The Chair of the Review Committee will facilitate the meeting and maintain the time limit.

360 Administrator Review Survey

The first step to obtaining review from multiple stakeholders is the 360 Administrator Survey. The survey is in the University of Arizona – University Wide organization library in Qualtrics, in the Faculty Affairs folder. Instructions on how to copy this survey into your own Qualtrics library and produce a report [can be found here](#).

Committees will use the 360 Administrator Review Survey available from Faculty Affairs that reflects the five key metrics of the review.

- The committee may add any additional items they feel are necessary to reflect unique elements of the unit. Existing questions cannot be modified. Open-ended questions are not allowed. To gather representative input from such stakeholder groups, committees need to communicate the importance of filling out the survey.
- The one-page summary from the administrator's self-study will be provided before the survey questions.
- Survey assessments by definition include input from a range of perspectives, including faculty, staff, students and other constituencies and collaborators. The constituents will be identified by the administrator and the review committee.
- The committee will also be available to meet in person with individuals or groups upon request. Information about in-person meetings should be sent out at the same time as the survey. Committees generally find the survey assessment to be the principal means for gathering input.

If you have any questions about this survey or the 360 process, please contact Dr. Adrián Arroyo Pérez, arroyopa@arizona.edu.

Open Hours, Interviews & Focus Groups

To get input from multiple groups, committees often schedule open forums and open hours for staff, for faculty and occasionally for students or external constituencies depending on the duties of the administrator. Some committees also gather input from small-group discussions or individual interviews with the administrators' peers, for example other deans or department heads for the review of a dean or head. To ensure open-ended and balanced questions, committee members are encouraged to use the suggested discussion starters (See Appendix B) to guide meetings. Those discussion questions can help committees focus on the leadership expectations that provide the suggested framework for assessing administrators.

Committees may find that the most challenging part of the review process is interpreting the varied feedback from the survey and various meetings. However, the more challenging part of interpreting the data is often analyzing the themes

that emerge from the individuals' comments in meetings. Thematic analyses of responses require some time; thematic analyses can help committees move beyond identifying strengths and weaknesses to develop constructive feedback on how administrators can improve their effectiveness by changing how they interact with coworkers and respond to challenges. Such feedback can also be developed by doing analyses of the responses to consider if there are significant differences in how women, QT+BIPOC (Queer, Trans, Black, Indigenous, or People of Color), and other groups assess the administrator.

Writing the Committee Report

The committee report should be no more than 5 pages with appendices that include analysis of the 360 assessment and the open-ended feedback. This report is confidential and will not be shared in public forums. Five-year reports are often organized around the leadership expectations set out in UHAP 5.3.01 to evaluate "administrators on their leadership in developing collaborations and managing resources to build capacity and advance innovation." The major sections draw input from discussions and survey responses, which are generally analyzed in more detail in the concluding section of the committee's report. HR consultants will meet with the administrator when they receive the review and help them interpret the survey findings.

The organization set out below is a suggestion that highlights connections among the major dimensions of the leadership expectations:

- **One-page overview of findings**
- **Introduction:** Five-year reviews generally begin by summarizing the administrator's duties, and key contextual factors for the unit in the past five years. The committee members should be listed with their affiliations.
- **Review and Recommendation:** The next section will be organized by findings of strengths, and recommendations for improvement for each of the following areas: A) Trust; B) Collaboration C) Maximizing Resources D) Achieving Results E) Instilling Inclusive Excellence.
 - The committee may consider issues such as general effectiveness, responding to concerns, learning from mistakes, focusing on how the administrator manages resources, including recruiting high performers, supporting their development, advancing innovations to achieve strategic goals, maintaining operational effectiveness, and data-based planning.
- **Conclusion & Recommendations:** A brief summary of the overview of findings and recommendations for the administrator moving forward.
- **Appendices:** This may include detailed tabulations of survey responses and brief summaries of the process of data collection.

The committee report is shared with the Administrator's Supervisor who will then finalize and share with the administrator.

APPENDICES

- A. Suggested Questions for Meeting with Administrators and the Review Committee
- B. 360 Administrator Review Survey
- C. Instructions on how to copy the 360 survey into your Qualtrics library, create an anonymous link and on how to produce a 360 report in Qualtrics.
- D. Committee Chair: Recommended Questions for Interviews and Focus Groups
- E. Committee Chair: Confidentiality Agreement

Appendix A

Introduction for any session

This process is not designed to influence reappointment or termination— we want to know issues and how to address the issues and to make things better. This can happen at any time, it is separate from review. That is not the job of the committee.

Suggested Questions for Meeting with Administrators and the Review Committee

These are suggested questions to use for the review committee when they meet with the administrator at the beginning of the process, after they have received the self-study. This is an opportunity for the committee to ask for more details beyond the written document or to clarify any questions that may have arisen.

1. As you reflect back over the past five-years as an administrator, what was the impact of your leadership?
2. Reflecting back over the last few years, what are the challenges you have faced in terms of leading your unit? What has been your role to address the challenges? What would you do differently in the future? What lessons have you learned as an administrator after facing these issues?
3. What do you see as the greatest opportunities facing you? What do you need to do to realize this potential?
4. What challenges are currently facing your unit? How are you prepared to face them? What additional input do you feel you need to prepare for the next phase of your leadership?
5. Describe the key stakeholders that participate in your unit that should be included in providing input on this process.
6. What kind of feedback would be helpful in this assessment? What are you hoping to learn from this opportunity to gather input from faculty, staff, students, and university and community partners?
7. What have been your primary goals for your unit and how have you achieved results with respect to those goals?

Appendix B

360 Assessment

The University of Arizona is committed to growth and development of administrators. As part of this process, we provide them with the opportunity to obtain informal, honest, and constructive feedback from staff and faculty with whom they interact. This feedback provides them with rich and actionable items to help them develop themselves as leaders. Please review [guidelines](#) and policy ([UHAP 5.2](#)) for five year performance review process for administrators.

We would appreciate you taking a few moments to share your perspective on this administrator's leadership skills. The survey should take approximately 5-8 minutes to complete. The survey has been constructed to ensure your responses remain anonymous (except for the supervisor).

Thank you for your participation in this important process. If you have any questions, please contact Faculty Affairs at facultyaffairs@email.arizona.edu or 520-626-0202.

- Please indicate your relationship to the administrator who is under review.

- ☐ Supervisee
- ☐ Peer
- ☐ Supervisor
- ☐ Self
- ☐ Community member external to University of Arizona

- **Metric 1. Building trust** by communicating a guiding vision, operating in an ethical manner, being accessible and responsive, maintaining composure, accountability, and acknowledging the lessons to be learned from misstep.

**** All metrics are evaluated using a matrix with the following options:***

- ☐ N/A or not known
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Often
- ☐ Most of the time
- ☐ All the time

Please indicate the frequency in which the administrator engages in the following actions:

1. Sets clear expectations for staff and/or faculty in their unit.
2. Gives useful feedback in a positive way.
3. Is transparent in communications about decisions
4. Listens well to faculty and/or staff in their unit
5. Shares information effectively with faculty and/or staff in their unit.
6. Provides regular feedback effectively with faculty and/or staff in their unit.
7. Is effective at sharing information from more senior leaders with the unit.
8. Stays calm and composed in high-pressured difficult situations.
9. Holds self responsible for own actions.
10. Accessible to unit members when they want to talk, seek advice, or give input.

- **Metric 2 Fostering collaboration** by effectively managing conflicts, forging partnerships both internal and external to the university setting, as well as advancing shared purposes in a manner that includes diverse perspectives in collaborative decision making.

1. Effectively implements shared governance practices.
2. Effectively works with partners across campus.
3. Serves as a good conduit between the unit and peer leaders.
4. Is effective at communicating with more senior leaders.
5. Helps the unit develop shared purposes and work together collaboratively.
6. Effectively collaborates to develop a shared strategic plan for the unit.
7. Actively seeks out input on key decisions or before implementing new practices/processes.
8. Effectively helps own team to understand the views and decisions of senior leaders and how they impact the unit.

- **Metric 3 Maximizing resources** by recruiting and retaining high quality coworkers, helping them develop through coaching and assessment, improving operational effectiveness, and advancing data-based planning.

1. Develops, implements, and communicates a budget plan to strategically support the unit.
2. Actively works to improve efficiencies in budgets.
3. Recruits and retains quality staff and/or faculty to build a high-performing unit.
4. Implements or helps to implement creative strategies for long-term financial sustainability.
5. Develops a strategic plan for the sustainability and success of the unit.
6. Models how to find sustainable solutions for complex problems.
7. Communicates analysis of department metrics in ways that I can understand.
8. Trusts that members of the unit can effectively make decisions on their own without direct oversight.

- **Metric 4 Achieving** results by identifying opportunities, challenging received assumptions, taking strategic risks, and advancing innovations in a decisive and strategic manner that is attuned to the priorities of the unit and university.

1. Delivers on commitments.
2. Makes difficult decisions in a timely manner.
3. Aligns the unit's vision and goals with the university strategic plan.
4. Implements the vision of the unit with concrete goals and milestones.
5. Effectively communicates unit results and successes to stakeholders.
6. Holds individuals accountable for results.
7. Communicates the importance of institutional compliance to staff and faculty.
8. Effectively communicates strengths of the unit to senior leaders, deans, and external stakeholders.

- **Metric 5 Inclusive excellence** by building community, advancing diversity and inclusion by improving climate, responding to bias, and soliciting/supporting diverse perspectives and experiences.

1. Values and continuously promotes equity, diversity and inclusion.
2. Supports diverse perspectives and experiences within the unit.
3. Models integrity in work interactions.
4. Creates an environment where disrespectful behavior is not tolerated.
5. Offers effective solutions to improve climate and responds effectively to bias.
6. Makes productive use of differences by creating a culture where individuals feel safe to disagree.
7. Adapts and leads through challenge, change, adversity and ambiguity.
8. Effectively communicates the mission and purpose of the unit to a variety of stakeholders.

Appendix C

Please refer to [this video](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=znotLmY7Zuo) (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=znotLmY7Zuo>) for instructions on how to:

1. Copy the 360 survey into your Qualtrics library.
2. Create an anonymous link and distribute survey (min. 2:49 on video).
3. Produce a 360 report in Qualtrics (min. 3:15 on video).

Appendix D

Recommended Questions for Interviews and Focus Groups

This five-year review process is designed to help the Provost [or dean] assess the particular strengths and challenges and to provide the administrator with feedback that acknowledges his or her successes and offers guidance about areas for future focus. We appreciate your feedback today and invite you to provide additional comments at the end of this session. We will be taking notes, but names will not be linked to comments.

We are interested in your assessment of the administrator's leadership. Administrators at the University of Arizona are assessed on their leadership in developing partnerships and managing resources to advance innovations, build partnerships, and improve effectiveness.

We'd like to get your input in five general areas:

1. **Building trust** by communicating a guiding vision, operating in an ethical manner, being accessible and responsive, maintaining composure, and acknowledging the lessons to be learned from missteps;
2. **Fostering collaboration** by effectively managing conflicts, forging partnerships and advancing shared purposes in a manner that includes diverse perspectives in collaborative decision making;
3. **Maximizing resources** by recruiting and retaining high quality coworkers, helping them develop through coaching and assessment, improving operational effectiveness, and advancing data-based planning;
4. **Achieving results** by identifying opportunities, challenging received assumptions, taking strategic risks, and advancing innovations in a decisive and strategic manner that is attuned to the priorities of the unit and university.

1. BUILDING TRUST: What are the administrator's strengths and challenges as a leader?

- Have they been effective at communicating a shared vision?
- Have they communicated that vision to build consensus and engagement?
- Have they helped solve problems in a decisive manner that fosters trust?
- Do they stay calm and responsive in high-pressure situations?
- Do they acknowledge lessons learned?

2. FOSTERING COLLABORATION: Have the administrator fostered collaboration within the unit, university and with external partners?

- Have they strengthened relationships with other university units and leaders?
- Have they strengthened relationships with alumni, community partners, donors, professional associations, and other agencies and groups?
- Do they effectively manage conflicts?
- Do they effectively include diverse perspectives in collaborative decision making?

3. MAXIMIZING RESOURCES: Have the administrator managed operations and budgets effectively?

- Have they succeeded in securing resources, including external and internal funds?
- Have they efficiently managed budgets, personnel and other resources?
- Have they helped improve operations and the effectiveness of those who report to her?
- Have they recruited and retained high quality coworkers?
- have they helped colleagues, staff and students through coaching and assessment?

4. ACHIEVING RESULTS: Have the administrator improved the effectiveness of the people who work in the unit?

- Have they identified opportunities for the unit?
- Have they challenged previous assumptions?
- Have they taken strategic risks?
- Have they or she advanced innovations in a decisive and strategic manner that is aligned with the priorities of the unit and the university?

5. INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE: Have the administrator improved equity, diversity and inclusiveness in the unit?

- Have they continuously promoted equitable practices and initiatives in the unit?
- Have they nurtured a diverse team in the unit?
- Have they supported a respectful environment where diverse perspectives and experiences are valued?
- Have they performed effective actions that challenge the lack of diversity, inequities, and exclusionary practices in the unit?

Appendix E



UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

For Service on an Interview, Review or Other Personnel Committee

As a member of this committee, I understand that I will be provided with confidential personnel information. All information, including but not limited to, information derived from applications, investigatory documents, correspondence, e-mail and electronic communications, telephone communications, video conferencing communications and oral conversations, whether in or outside the committee meetings, shall be restricted to those members of the committee who are directly involved with the deliberations of the committee.

I understand my role on this committee is to fairly and neutrally evaluate the candidate/applicant. As such, I understand that it is my obligation to acknowledge and report any conflict of interest I may have with regard to this process including significant prior knowledge of the underlying circumstances, a personal or professional relationship with any involved party, or a vested interest in the outcome of the committee's decision or recommendation. I acknowledge that if a conflict of interest prevents my participation in the committee, I am still bound by this Confidentiality Agreement.

In order to protect such information, I acknowledge and agree to keep all information confidential. This acknowledgement covers all materials that I receive as part of my work on the committee, all discussions in committee and related meetings, and all emails, correspondence, and documents related to the work of the committee. I agree not to forward such emails or materials to anyone who is not on the committee unless requested to do so by the committee chair. I also agree not to discuss the discussions, correspondence, or business of the committee with anyone not on the committee unless assigned to do so by the committee.

I acknowledge and understand that the information distributed and obtained by me as part of my work on this committee belongs to the University of Arizona, and upon the conclusion of the work of the committee, I agree to return all confidential personnel information and documentation related to the committee assignment back to the committee chair.

I understand and accept this promise of confidentiality as a condition of my appointment to and service on this committee. I understand that any violation of the conditions of this confidentiality agreement may result in immediate dismissal from the committee, as well as other appropriate sanctions. In addition, I acknowledge and understand that the disclosure of confidential personnel information can be considered a violation of University policy, and that I may be disciplined for inappropriately providing confidential information to outside parties.

Upon reading this Confidentiality Agreement, I hereby sign and agree to serve on the committee under these provisions:

Assigned Role

Signature of Interview Committee Member

Date