

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Academic Affairs Shared Governance Implementation Team Spring 2024 Report

Membership

Chair(s):

Sasha Kokhan, College of Science and Mathematics, Faculty Senate, Co-Chair
Elizabeth Oldmixon, Faculty Affairs and Curriculum, Vice Provost, Co-Chair

Members:

• John Allemeier, College of Visual and Performing Arts, Academic Unit Head • Audrey Burnett, University Studies, Associate Dean • Mindy Capaldi, College of Science and Mathematics, Associate Dean • Becky Childs, College of Arts and Letters, Academic Unit Head • Carol Dudding, College of Health and Behavioral Studies, Faculty • Bill Grant, College of Business, Faculty • Smita Mathur, College of Education, Faculty Senate • Kristen McCleary, College of Arts and Letters, Faculty Senate • Michael O'Fallon, Faculty Affairs and Curriculum, Associate Vice Provost • Daniel Robinson, School of Professional and Continuing Education, Academic Unit Head • Jessica Salvatore, College of Health and Behavioral Studies, Academic Unit Head • Brian Sullivan, Libraries, Faculty • Rhonda Syler, College of Business, Academic Unit Head • Jeff Tang, College of Integrated Science and Engineering, Associate Dean • Roger Thelwell, College of Science and Mathematics, Faculty • JT Todd, Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression, Faculty

Charge: The Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Academic Affairs Shared Governance Implementation Team will continue the significant work of the Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Academic Affairs Shared Governance Task Force by reviewing the Spring 2023 recommendations and working closely with the co-chairs to assess specific recommendations and set goals and timelines for implementation.

Summary of Current Semester Activity:

- Over the course of the academic year, the SGIT reviewed all Shared Governance Task Force recommendations and classified them based on the order in which they would be addressed.
- We created working groups within the committee. The working groups were assigned different recommendations to consider.
- Five recommendations **were classified as moot** because of work already being done or almost completed
 - M3. Advance these recommendations as one JMU
 - 3i. Senate Subcommittee on Shared Governance
 - 7b. Rotating Department Chairs
 - 7h. Faculty Input into our R2 Development
 - 4b. Faculty Voices on Climate Implementation
- Work was **mostly completed and moved to the next level of approval/implementation** on two recommendations
 - 2b. Revising the Faculty Handbook

- 7e. Evaluation of Administrators
- Work is **in progress** on 11 recommendations, and in some cases, we are **nearly done**.
 - M1. Protect Tenure and Academic Freedom
 - M2. Slow down
 - M4. Include all faculty
 - M6. Stay accountable for progress
 - 1b. Shared Governance Statement
 - 3e. Shared Governance at the Unit Level
 - 3g. Access to Information
 - 5e. Conflict of Interests
 - 7a. Communicating Accountability
 - 7c. Interim AUHs
 - 7d. AAUH Policies

Future Work Planned:

- The remaining recommendations will receive full consideration in the 24-25 academic year.
- Dr. Oldmixon’s office is working on a better webpage to share our progress. This would be akin to the [TFRE recommendations page](#).
- Over the summer Drs. Kokhan and Oldmixon will do some planning for the fall. It took a while for our committee to really hit its stride, but we’ve made good progress and built a solid foundation for future work.

Appendices

Attach any additional documents as necessary to illustrate accomplishments, plans, or work in progress. If appendices are used, begin with a Table of Appendices to enumerate the attachments.

Table of Appendices

Number or Title	Brief Description
2b	A process for revision of the Faculty Handbook has been developed and endorsed by a vote of the Faculty Senate. Selection of the committee members is underway. More details are available below.
7e	A draft of Academic Affairs policy on Evaluations of Administrators has been developed and can be found below. It is currently under review in the Academic Affairs Policies Committee in accordance with the Academic Affairs Policy #000
3i	The JMU Faculty Senate Bylaws were updated to create a standing committee on Shared Governance (Article IV.13). The committee was formed in December 2023
7h	The JMU Faculty Senate Bylaws were updated to create a standing committee on Research and Scholarship (Article IV.6). The work is in

	progress on establishing regular communication channels and pathways for input from faculty on research and scholarship support and infrastructure.
--	--

Faculty Handbook: Major Revision

Introduction

The Faculty Handbook is the cornerstone for shared governance at James Madison University. As such, it must clearly articulate policies, specify the faculty's duties, rights, and responsibilities, and reflect the university's culture. A comprehensive revision of the Faculty Handbook is necessary to meet the evolving needs of our institution and its community. The Handbook has been revised iteratively for well over a decade (maybe decades?) as the University has gained national prominence, weathered a global pandemic, and grown student enrollments. We need a thoroughly revised handbook to meet the moment. This aligns with recommendation 2a of the Joint Senate/Provost's Task Force on Shared Governance Report:

Commission a joint faculty/administrative group to undertake a comprehensive review and wholesale re-write of the Faculty Handbook, to carefully consider and address flaws and points of confusion in handbook areas in need of greater clarity, such as the faculty grievance policy. This group should make such revisions with an eye to developing and enhancing structures and policies related to shared governance. Establish a regular schedule of whole-scale refresh and re-consideration (alongside the regular, more incremental work of the handbook committee). Give special consideration to the role of shared governance throughout.

Committee Expectations (subject to revision)

The revision committee will:

1. Propose substantive and organizational changes to the Faculty Handbook. This shall be done in consultation with appropriate internal and external experts, including, but not limited to, the Senate, divisional administrators, and Human Resources.
2. Meet regularly throughout the process with various constituencies of the University community, including open forums for the entire campus community and meetings with smaller constituencies. The purpose of these meetings is to solicit input. Meetings and open forums shall also inform the campus community of the committee's progress.
3. Provide regular updates to the University community.

Process

This proposal outlines a plan for a major revision that will ensure the Handbook remains a dynamic and relevant resource, fostering faculty success, promoting shared governance, and ultimately supporting our students' transformative educational experiences. By fostering transparency, collaboration, and inclusivity throughout the revision process, we hope to create

a Handbook that empowers faculty, strengthens JMU's academic identity, and positions us for sustainable growth and innovation. The process would include the following steps.

Suggested Timeline

Timeframe	Benchmark
<i>April 2024</i>	The Provost and Senate Steering approve the revision plan and apprise President Alger <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan will include committee composition, selection method, and timeline suggestions. • This process should replace the regular review and receive Senate approval. • The Speaker and Provost will draft a charge, informed by the language in this proposal.
<i>April 2024</i>	The Speaker and Provost will brief the AEC at the BOV meeting.
<i>May 2024</i>	The review committee and technical writer are selected.
<i>June 2024</i>	The review committee will launch a survey to the University community soliciting feedback on the current FH and suggestions for revision—major and minor.
<i>Summer 2024</i>	The technical writer reviews the JMU Faculty Handbook and other models and develops structural models for the committee’s consideration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members will carefully review the JMU FH • Michael O’Fallon works with the technical writer to create a resource page on Teams that links to FH examples.
<i>September 2024</i>	The committee chooses the FH structure and commences substantive work. (Structure should be considered separately from substance.)
<i>October 2024</i>	The review committee should hold an open forum to provide updates and solicit feedback.
<i>December 2024</i>	The committee briefs the Senate and AC.
<i>March 2025</i>	Before spring break, the review committee should hold an open forum to provide updates and solicit feedback.
<i>April 2025</i>	Draft completed
<i>May 2025</i>	Stakeholder Comment Period <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUPACs, AUHs, Senate, AC
<i>June and July 2025</i>	The review committee works with the technical writer to incorporate feedback.
<i>August 2025</i>	The revised draft is shared with the University community. Academic units are encouraged to schedule September meetings for faculty to discuss the draft.
<i>September 2025</i>	Public comment period for the new draft
<i>October 2025</i>	The review committee works with the technical writer to incorporate feedback. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This process includes consultation with the Speaker, Provost, and President.
<i>November 2025</i>	The Provost and Speaker update the AEC at the BOV meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that when/if the President approves the new draft in December 2025, it takes provisional effect until the February 2026 BOV meeting.
<i>December 2025</i>	President Alger approves the new draft.
<i>February 2026</i>	BOV reviews and approves new FH.

Suggested Review Committee Composition

This committee must be developed in accordance with Meta Recommendation 8 of the Shared Governance Task Force Report, which calls for broad participation in shared governance initiatives.

As depicted in the table below, the review committee will consist of five instructional faculty members elected in an open slate election among the seven academic colleges and the Libraries, three faculty senators appointed by the Speaker, and four Provost appointees—one

dean, one administrator from the provost’s office, one AUH, and one additional appointee. Nominations and self-nominations will be solicited for participation in the open slate election. The participants will be determined by a secret ballot plurality vote conducted via Question Pro (or an equivalent platform). No more than one person may be elected from each college.

Constituency	Participants
Instructional Faculty members (elected in an open slate)	5
Faculty Senators (Speaker appointees)	3
Provost’s Office (Provost appointee)	1
Dean (Provost appointee)	1
At large (Provost appointee)	1
Academic Unit Head (Provost appointee)	1

Note: University Counsel would work with the committee in a non-voting advisory capacity. A non-voting technical writer will assist in drafting the FH.

Review Committee Member Responsibilities

Participants' primary responsibilities will be receiving and reflecting on stakeholder feedback, co-creating a draft handbook revision, participating in open meetings, and assisting the committee leadership with external communication as needed. During the review process, the participants represent the faculty and Academic Affairs as a whole rather than the participant’s department, college, or administrative office. All participants must be available for regular meetings and asynchronous work. For the committee to make good progress, participating instructional faculty on ten-month contracts will need a significant workload shift, which will be negotiated with their AUH and dean.

Academic Affairs Policy #XX

Academic Administrator Evaluations, Term Assessments and Reappointments

Date of Current Revision:

Primary Responsible Officer: Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

1. PURPOSE

The Division of Academic Affairs recognizes that good leadership is essential for our overall success and the well-being of our academic community. We are committed to fostering an environment where our leaders can perform well, flourish, and reach their full potential. In that spirit, this policy helps leaders identify areas for improvement and opportunities for support and professional development.

This policy provides the procedures for evaluating and giving feedback to academic administrators. Academic administrators may be A&P or instructional faculty, depending on their responsibilities. In the case of instructional faculty, academic administrators have administrative workload responsibilities assigned by the Provost, a dean, or a vice provost. Academic administrators are expected to exhibit leadership qualities based on the ability to lead and work with people within and outside the University community, experience, and academic achievement consistent with the responsibilities of their position. Their responsibilities to and on behalf of the University may also be stated in their appointment letter, applicable Board of Visitors policies, and as directed by the President and/or the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost).

The Division of Academic Affairs is committed to the fair and consistent review of academic administrators. The Provost is responsible for evaluating and determining reappointment for academic administrators reporting directly to the Provost. Administrators reporting to the Provost are responsible for evaluating the academic administrators that report to them and determining reappointment in consultation with the Provost.

2. AUTHORITY

The Board of Visitors is given the authority to establish policies for the university. This power is delegated to the President in areas where the Board has not established policy. See Code of Virginia section 23.1-1602; 23.1-1301. The President has delegated the establishment of policies and procedures concerning the Division of Academic Affairs to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. DEFINITIONS

Academic Unit Head (AUH)

AUH, or the functional equivalent of that position, is an academic administrator responsible for leading and managing an academic unit. Any administrator regardless of title, who manages

instructional faculty is evaluated under the AUH procedure in this document. AUHs serve at the discretion of their dean.

Instructional Faculty

The members of the faculty who have responsibilities that include teaching, research and service as the majority of their duties.

Academic Administrators

Academic administrators are Administrative Faculty as defined by University Policy 1307, or instructional faculty with administrative responsibilities, such as AUHs, associate and assistant deans (A-Deans), and center directors and executive directors of academic centers. In the case of instructional faculty, academic administrators are designated as such by the Provost or the dean/vice provost to whom they report.

Voting Member of an Academic Unit

Voting members of an academic unit must include all full-time instructional faculty members in the unit, except instructional faculty members with more than a 50 percent administrative workload assignment outside the department and the administrator being evaluated. For the purposes of administrator evaluations, units may choose to enfranchise other full-time employees, such as classified staff members, professional faculty, and lab coordinators.

4. APPLICABILITY

Academic administrators, including deans, vice provosts, A-Deans, associate vice provosts, directors and executive directors, and AUHs in the Division of Academic Affairs. In the case of Administrative Faculty (as defined by University Policy 1335), this policy complements University Policy 1307. In instances of conflict between University Policy and Academic Affairs Policy XXX, University Policy 1307 takes precedence. This policy does not apply to academic administrators unless they have a faculty appointment in an academic unit.

5. POLICY

5.1 Terms of Appointment and Reappointment

Consistent with UP 1335, administrative appointments are typically for one year, with no limit on the number of reappointments. In the Division of Academic Affairs, however, administrators typically serve for defined periods of service as outlined in this policy. These administrators receive annual performance reviews and periodic term assessments, both of which inform reappointment decisions.

5.1.1 Initial Appointments

The initial term of appointment for academic administrators evaluated under this policy will be four years.

5.1.2 Reappointment

Administrative terms are renewable, subject to annual evaluations, term assessments, and the discretion of the supervisor. AUHs may not be reappointed unless a majority of voting members of the unit endorse continued service. The vote shall be conducted pursuant to section 5.3.2.e.

5.2 Deans and Vice Provosts

5.2.1 Annual Review

Consistent with University Policy 1307, the Provost will annually evaluate deans and vice provosts in the Division of Academic Affairs. Deans and vice provosts will provide an annual written report to the Provost. The report will serve as the basis for written performance reviews and individual annual performance meetings between the Provost and deans/vice provosts. The Office of the Provost is responsible for initiating annual reviews.

The annual review provides a performance overview, ensuring individuals are meeting expectations and contributing effectively to the division's work. It also helps academic leaders assess their strengths and weaknesses, understand their impact, and set goals for the future. Annual evaluations aim to create a win-win situation, fostering individual growth and propelling the division toward collective success.

5.2.1.a Feedback and Review Components

The evaluated administrator will write a brief self-assessment providing an overview of their work, accomplishments, ongoing projects, and growth areas.

The Office of the Provost will solicit feedback from peers and employees supervised by the administrator. Feedback may be gathered using several modalities, including online surveys and meetings with an administrator designated by the Provost to gather such information. Participants must have the opportunity to provide feedback anonymously. The feedback will only be available to the Provost and their designee. The administrator being evaluated will also be provided with anonymized feedback.

Accompanying the solicitation of feedback, the Office of Provost will provide the administrator's self-assessment, job description, and a brief description of the priorities assigned to the administrator by the Provost.

5.2.1.b Evaluation

Based on the information collected under 5.2.1.a and the Provost's assessment of the administrator's performance, the Provost will complete an annual review document in accordance with University Policy 1307. Based on the evaluation, the Provost should ensure that the administrator being evaluated has appropriate mentoring and professional development opportunities.

5.2.1.c Closing the Loop

Within one month of receiving their evaluation, administrators must provide the personnel in their unit with a self-assessment written in light of their evaluation. This is not intended as a point-for-point reaction to all feedback and evaluation components. Administrators are encouraged to reflect on the evaluation holistically and discuss changes moving forward as applicable. This shall be done in written or electronic form and may be augmented by a face-to-face discussion with unit personnel. This provision is waived if the administrator will not continue in their position.

5.2.2 Term Assessment

Every four years, deans and vice provosts will undergo a term assessment, distinct from and replacing the annual review. Term assessments provide an important inflection point for the deans/vice provosts and the Provost to consider longer-term plans, as well as a more fulsome assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and impact. This also provides an inflection point for faculty, staff, and administrators to reflect and weigh in on the direction of their leadership. As with annual evaluations, the aim is to create a win-win situation, fostering individual growth and propelling the division toward collective success.

5.2.2.a Term Assessment Committee

The Provost will solicit nominations (including self-nominations) and then appoint a Term Assessment Committee (TAC) to gather review materials (specified in 5.1.2.b) and provide a comprehensive, confidential assessment in writing of the employee's performance, identifying and discussing opportunities for learning and improvement, as well as accomplishments and growth over the long-term. TACs must be chaired by a peer at the same reporting level.

In the case of deans, TACs will be comprised of faculty from the college led by the dean receiving the assessment and other members of the university community with relevant knowledge and expertise. In the case of vice provosts, TACs will comprise employees from the office led by the vice provost receiving the assessment and other university community members with relevant knowledge and expertise. The final decision regarding the composition of the committee rests with the Provost. The assessment is a confidential personnel process, and the committee is expected to maintain confidentiality in all aspects of its work.

5.2.2.b Required Term Assessment Components

Term assessments will gather the following components:

- An in-depth self-assessment that includes reflection on and discussion of achievements and accomplishments related to the position's established goals and objectives, as well as areas of growth while serving in leadership. The self-assessment narrative may also include significant activities and accomplishments not previously stated as goals and objectives.
- A curriculum vitae;
- A job description;

- A brief description of projects and priorities assigned by the Provost; and,
- Feedback from a broader array of administrative peers, faculty, and staff. The TAC will solicit feedback, which may be gathered using several modalities, including online surveys and meetings with the TAC chair. Individual participants must have the opportunity to provide in-depth qualitative feedback and to provide feedback anonymously. The feedback will only be available to the Provost and TAC. The administrator being evaluated will also be provided with anonymized feedback.

5.2.2.c Evaluation

Based on the information collected under 5.2.2.b and the Provost's assessment of the administrator's performance, the Provost will complete a term assessment review document in accordance with University Policy 1307. Based on the evaluation, the Provost should ensure that the administrator being evaluated has appropriate mentoring and professional development opportunities.

5.2.3.d Closing the Loop

Within one month of receiving their term assessment, administrators must provide the personnel in their college/office with a self-assessment written in light of their term assessment. This is not intended as a point-for-point reaction to all feedback and assessment components. Administrators are encouraged to reflect on the assessment holistically and discuss changes moving forward and plans for their next term, as applicable. This shall be done in written or electronic form and may be augmented by a face-to-face discussion with unit personnel. This provision is waived if the administrator will not continue in their position.

5.3 AUHs

5.3.1 Annual Review

Deans will annually evaluate AUHs in the Division of Academic Affairs. AUHs will provide an annual written report to their dean. The report will serve as the basis for written performance reviews and individual annual performance meetings between the deans and their AUHs. Deans are responsible for initiating annual reviews for the AUHs in their respective colleges. Annual reviews provide a performance overview, ensuring individuals are meeting expectations and contributing effectively to the division's work. They also help academic leaders assess their strengths and weaknesses, understand their impact, and set goals for the future. Ultimately, annual evaluations aim to create a win-win situation, fostering individual growth and propelling the division toward collective success.

5.3.1.a Feedback and Review Components

The AUH being evaluated will write a brief self-assessment providing an overview of their work, accomplishments, ongoing projects, and growth areas.

The dean will solicit feedback from employees supervised by the AUH. Feedback may be gathered using several modalities, including online surveys and meetings with an administrator designated by the dean to gather such information. Participants must have the opportunity to

provide feedback anonymously. The feedback will only be available to the dean and their designee. The AUH being evaluated will also be provided with anonymized feedback.

Accompanying the solicitation of feedback, the dean will provide the AUH's self-assessment, job description, and a brief description of the priorities assigned to the AUH by the dean.

5.3.1.b Evaluation

Based on the information collected under 5.3.1.a and dean's assessment of the AUH's performance, the Provost will complete an annual review document. Based on the evaluation, the dean should ensure that the AUH being evaluated has appropriate mentoring and professional development opportunities.

5.3.1.c Closing the Loop

Within one month of receiving their evaluation, AUHs must provide the personnel in their unit with a self-assessment written in light of their evaluation. This is not intended as a point-for-point reaction to all feedback and evaluation components. Administrators are encouraged to reflect on the evaluation holistically and discuss changes moving forward as applicable. This shall be done in written or electronic form and may be augmented by a face-to-face discussion with unit personnel. This provision is waived if the administrator will not continue in their position.

5.3.2 Term Assessment

AUHs will undergo a term assessment every four years, distinct from and replacing the annual review. Term assessments provide an important inflection point for AUHs and deans to consider longer-term plans, as well as a more fulsome assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and impact. This also provides an inflection point for faculty and staff to reflect and weigh in on the direction of their leadership. As with annual evaluations, the aim is to create a win-win situation, fostering individual growth and propelling the division toward collective success.

5.3.2.a Term Assessment Process

The dean may appoint a TAC or designate an individual to gather the formative assessment components to gather review materials (specified in 5.2.2.b) and provide a comprehensive, confidential assessment in writing of the AUH's performance, identifying and discussing opportunities for learning and improvement, as well as accomplishments and growth over the long-term. Appointing a TAC or designating an individual should be informed by college-level guidelines and not determined on an ad hoc basis. The designee must be at the same or a higher reporting level as the employee receiving the assessment and may be from outside the college. If the dean appoints a TAC, the dean will solicit nominations (including self-nominations). TAC chairs/dean designees must be at the same reporting level as the AUH, but they may be from outside the college.

5.3.2.b Required Term Assessment Components

Term assessments will gather the following components:

- An in-depth self-assessment that includes reflection on and discussion of achievements and accomplishments related to the position's established goals and objectives, as well as areas of growth while serving in leadership. The self-assessment narrative may also include significant activities and accomplishments not previously stated as goals and objectives.
- A curriculum vitae;
- A job description;
- A brief description of projects and priorities assigned by the Provost;
- A faculty vote (see 5.2.2.e); and,
- Feedback from a broader array of administrative peers, faculty, and staff. The TAC/designee will solicit feedback, which may be gathered using several modalities, including online surveys and meetings with the TAC chair. Individual participants must have the opportunity to provide in-depth qualitative feedback and to provide feedback anonymously. The feedback will only be available to the Provost, dean, and TAC/designee. The AUH being evaluated will also be provided with anonymized feedback.

5.3.2.c Evaluation

Based on the information collected under 5.3.2.b and the dean's assessment of the AUH's performance, the dean will complete a term assessment review document. Based on the evaluation, the dean should ensure that the AUH being evaluated has appropriate mentoring and professional development opportunities.

5.3.2.d Closing the Loop

Within one month of receiving their term assessment, AUHs must provide the personnel in their unit with a self-assessment written in light of their term assessment. This is not intended as a point-for-point reaction to all feedback and assessment components. Administrators are encouraged to reflect on the assessment holistically and discuss changes moving forward and plans for their next term, as applicable. This shall be done in written or electronic form and may be augmented by a face-to-face discussion with unit personnel. This provision is waived if the administrator will not continue in their position.

5.3.2.e Faculty Vote

The formative assessment shall include an anonymous vote among voting members of the unit on whether the unit endorses the continued service of the AUH. The vote shall be administered by the dean or a designee who does not report to the evaluated employee.

5.4 A-Deans, Associate Vice Provosts, and Center Directors and Executive Directors

The dean/vice provost/AUH will annually evaluate all A-Deans, associate vice provosts, and directors and executive directors in their college/unit/office. The administrators being evaluated will provide an annual written report to their supervising dean/vice provost/AUH. The report will serve as the basis for written performance reviews and individual annual

performance meetings. The supervising administrator is responsible for initiating annual reviews.

5.4.1 Annual Review

Deans/vice provosts/AUHs will evaluate A-Deans, associate vice provosts, directors, and executive directors in the Division of Academic Affairs annually. Administrators undergoing evaluation will provide an annual written report to their supervisory deans/vice provost/AUH. The report will serve as the basis for written performance reviews and annual performance meetings between supervisors and employees. Deans/vice provosts/AUHs are responsible for initiating annual reviews for the administrators in their respective colleges/units/offices.

The annual review provides a performance overview, ensuring individuals are meeting expectations and contributing effectively to the division's work. It also helps academic leaders assess their strengths and weaknesses, understand their impact, and set goals for the future. Ultimately, annual evaluations aim to create a win-win situation, fostering individual growth and propelling the division toward collective success.

5.4.1.a Feedback and Review Components

The evaluated administrator will write a brief self-assessment providing an overview of their work, accomplishments, ongoing projects, and growth areas.

The dean/vice provost/AUH will solicit feedback from employees supervised by the administrator being evaluated, if applicable. Feedback may be gathered using several modalities, including online surveys and meetings with an administrator designated by the dean/vice provost to gather such information. Participants must have the opportunity to provide feedback anonymously. The feedback will only be available to the dean and their designee. The administrator being evaluated will also be provided with anonymized feedback.

Accompanying the solicitation of feedback, the dean/vice provost/AUH will provide the administrator's self-assessment, job description, and a brief description of the priorities assigned to the administrator by the dean/vice provost/AUH.

5.4.1.b Evaluation

Based on the information collected under 5.4.1.a and dean/vice provost/AUH's assessment of the administrator's performance, the dean/vice provost/AUH will complete an annual review document. Based on the evaluation, the dean should ensure that the administrator being evaluated has appropriate mentoring and professional development opportunities.

5.4.1.c Closing the Loop

Within one month of receiving their evaluation, the administrator must provide the personnel reporting to them with a self-assessment written in light of their evaluation. This is not intended as a point-for-point reaction to all feedback and evaluation components. Administrators are encouraged to reflect on the evaluation holistically and discuss changes

moving forward as applicable. This shall be done in written or electronic form and may be augmented by a face-to-face discussion with unit personnel. This provision is waived if the administrator will not continue in their position.

5.4.2 Term Assessment

Every four years, administrators will undergo a term assessment, distinct from and replacing the annual review. Term assessments provide an important inflection point for the administrators and their supervisors to consider longer-term plans, as well as a more fulsome assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and impact. This also provides an inflection point for the administrator's team, where applicable, to reflect and weigh in on the direction of their leadership. As with annual evaluations, the aim is to create a win-win situation, fostering individual growth and propelling the division toward collective success.

5.4.2.a Term Assessment Process

The dean/vice provost/AUH may appoint a TAC or designate an individual to gather the formative assessment components to gather review materials (specified in 5.3.2.b) and provide a comprehensive, confidential assessment in writing of the administrator's performance, identifying and discussing opportunities for learning and improvement, as well as accomplishments and growth over the long-term. Appointing a TAC or designating an individual should be informed by college/unit/office-level guidelines and not determined on an ad hoc basis. The designee must be at the same or a higher reporting level as the employee receiving the assessment and may be from outside the college. If the dean/vice provost/AUH appoints a TAC, the dean/vice provost/AUH will solicit nominations (including self-nominations). TAC chairs/designees must be at the same reporting level as the administrator being evaluated, but they may be from outside the college/unit/office.

5.4.2.b Required Term Assessment Components

Term assessments will gather the following components:

- An in-depth self-assessment that includes reflection on and discussion of achievements and accomplishments related to the position's established goals and objectives, as well as areas of growth while serving in leadership. Additionally, the self-assessment narrative may include significant activities and accomplishments that were not previously stated as goals and objectives.
- A curriculum vitae;
- A job description;
- A brief description of projects and priorities assigned by the Provost; and,
- Feedback from a broader array of administrative peers, faculty, and staff. The TAC/designee will solicit feedback and gather it using several modalities, including online surveys and meetings with the TAC chair. Individual participants must have the opportunity to provide in-depth qualitative feedback and to provide feedback anonymously. The feedback will only be available to the Provost, dean/vice

provost/AUH, and TAC/designee. The administrator being evaluated will also receive anonymized feedback.

5.4.2.c Evaluation

Based on the information collected under 5.4.2.b and the dean/vice provost's assessment of the administrator's performance, the dean/vice provost will complete a term assessment review document. Based on the evaluation, the dean/vice provost should ensure that the administrator being evaluated has appropriate mentoring and professional development opportunities.

5.4.2.d Closing the Loop

Within one month of receiving their term assessment, administrators must provide the personnel in their college/office with a self-assessment written in light of their term assessment. This is not intended as a point-for-point reaction to all feedback and assessment components. Administrators are encouraged to reflect on the assessment holistically and discuss changes moving forward and plans for their next term, as applicable. This shall be done in written or electronic form and may be augmented by a face-to-face discussion with unit personnel. This provision is waived if the administrator will not continue in their position.

5.5 Timing

The Office of the Provost will issue an annual schedule of evaluations by October 1 each year. Consistent with University Policy 1307, the annual evaluation period for academic administrators evaluated under this policy is July 1 to June 30. The Annual Review process will be initiated in the spring semester and completed between June 1 and August 31 each year. The Term Assessment process will be initiated in the fall semester of the fourth year of administrators' terms and completed between June 1 and August 31 each year.

6. CROSS-REFERENCES

University Policy 1307 Performance Evaluation of Administrative & Professional Faculty
University Policy 1335 Administrative & Professional Faculty - Terms and Conditions of Employment