
5014: REVIEW/REAPPOINTMENT

A. GENERAL GUIDELINES

Annual reviews of Faculty Administrators by their Recommending Authorities are required. The review should consist of a meeting between the two individuals and completion of a form [form under construction]. A copy of the form should be sent to APO for the personnel file.

A full-term review is required during the last year of an Administrator's term. The term review should be initiated by the Recommending Authority and should be based upon the expectations and goals outlined in the appointment letter. The review should give higher levels of review (i.e., EVC/Provost) a rational basis for the decision whether or not to reappoint an individual, and at the same time, it should provide the individual under review with guidance on improving his or her performance.

This review is distinct from an academic review of the individual, but service as a Faculty Administrator can and should be considered in any academic review. Per **APM 245-11**, "Academic leadership is, in itself, a significant academic activity. Therefore, distinguished leadership and effective discharge of duties...shall be considered as appropriate criteria in evaluating the performance of a [Faculty Administrator] for a merit increase, accelerated increase, or promotion." The extent and quality of the administrative service, then, must be taken into consideration for merit advancements and promotions. It should also be acknowledged that a Faculty Administrator who discharges administrative duties with thoroughness and distinction will have reduced time available for teaching and research.

B. PROCESS

Early in the Fall semester of the final year of the Faculty Administrator's term, the Recommending Authority shall notify the Administrator of his or her eligibility for reappointment review. If the Administrator consents to be considered for another term, the following actions should be taken:

1. Self-Statement

The Faculty Administrator should provide a self-assessment of accomplishments in relation to the expectations of the position and any other relevant information regarding the term of service by December 15.

2. Faculty Consultation

Members of the department, program, or group being administered should be consulted in the review of the Administrator. The Recommending Authority may solicit letters or other forms of input from the appropriate constituents. If letters are solicited, they must be treated as confidential material in accordance with University policy, and they will be included in the review file. A summary of this input will be provided by the Recommending Authority in his or her statement.

3. Recommending Authority Memo

The official serving as Recommending Authority for the appointment (e.g., Dean, Vice Provost, etc.) will write a letter evaluating the Faculty Administrator's performance during the term of service. This evaluation will be conducted in the context of the expectations and goals set forth in the appointment letter.

4. Review Meeting

The Recommending Authority and the Faculty Administrator will meet to discuss the review, and the Administrator will be provided with copies of all documents, redacted as necessary. The Administrator will have ten business days to provide a written response to the file, if desired.

5. APO Documentation

The entire case file will be forwarded to the Vice Provost for the Faculty via the Academic Personnel Office by May 15. The VPF will review and forward the file to the EVC/Provost. The VPF and EVC/Provost will consult as needed and the EVC/Provost will render a final decision, via email, to the Recommending Authority. The Recommending Authority should then meet with the candidate to discuss the decision and, if the decision is for reappointment, to discuss goals and plans for the upcoming term. A written summary of this meeting should be forwarded to APO.

6. Reappointment Letter

If appropriate, the EVC/Provost will issue a reappointment letter via APO to the Faculty Administrator including all relevant appointment information including the criteria for the next review.