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**PURPOSE**:

To state the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences’ procedures for conducting the Academic Administrative Evaluation process (which goes beyond the annual faculty activity summary) as outlined in [AC14](https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ac14).

**PROCESS:**

There are two opportunities for academic administrative feedback:

1. An annual review from the administrative unit faculty
2. A more broadly cast assessment (two- and five-year assessments)

**ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEWS OF ADMINISTRATORS**

Faculty Reviews of Administrative Effectiveness (FRAE) are administered by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The feedback is sent to the Dean who will provide it to the academic administrator. The Dean will meet to discuss the feedback at the academic administrator’s request (optional).

**TWO- AND FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENTS**

**CRITERIA**:

The EMS Dean’s Office will determine the evaluation schedule, based upon the individual academic administrator’s start date in their qualifying position and the schedule of any previous reviews.

The EMS Tenure Line Faculty Advisory Committees will coordinate an evaluation of each academic administrator and director in the second and fifth year after their initial appointment. Thereafter, while the administrator or director remains in the position, evaluations will be conducted every fifth year. The Dean will review and evaluate the administrator based on each such evaluation. Feedback to the unit on the results of the evaluation will be provided by the Dean when the review is completed. In general terms that do not violate the confidentiality of the review or the incumbent’s response, the dean shall prepare a summary of the major findings and the incumbent’s objectives and goals for the next five years. This summary shall be distributed to faculty and staff in the academic unit. **Confidentiality of personnel evaluations shall be maintained**.

**ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR CONSTITUENCY:**

Department Head: their department faculty/staff listing, fellow department heads and institute directors, Associate/Assistant deans, and appropriate Dean's Office staff

Associate/Assistant Deans: all EMS faculty, their office staff, and appropriate Dean’s Office staff

Energy Institute (EI): all EI affiliates, EI staff, Energy and Mineral Engineering and Geosciences department heads, EESI director, Associate/Assistant Deans

Earth and Environmental Systems Institute (EESI): all EESI affiliates, EESI staff and faculty, Geosciences/Geography/Meteorology faculty and department heads, EI director, Associate/Assistant Deans

**DEAN’S REVIEW:**

All responses will be reviewed by the dean and they will meet with each academic administrator. During or after the meeting, each administrator will receive a tabulation of the evaluation and a retyped collection of the comments made by their constituency. The original documents will remain in the Dean’s Office.

**RESULTS:**

Favorable Review: If the ratings have been good and the administrator is willing to continue, the dean will notify the administrator and the faculty that the review is complete, and that the appointment will continue.

Unfavorable Review: However, if the most recent and the previous ratings indicate problems, the dean will consult with the administrator. If the problem can be resolved, the dean will notify the unit personnel that the evaluation is complete, and the administrator will continue. Within 30 days, the administrator under review shall submit a response concerning actions they have taken, which are underway, and what is planned for future implementation to address any perceived shortcomings.

If the problem is serious at the conclusion of the five-year review, the dean will first explore whether or not the administrator wishes to continue. If the administrator wishes to step down, then a replacement will be selected by standard procedure. If the administrator wishes to continue, then the dean will meet with the constituency of the administrator and explain the situation. The dean may choose to sponsor a secret ballot on whether or not to continue with the present administrator. After weighing all of the evidence, the dean will act either to continue or to relieve the administrator.

**FEEDBACK TO THE UNIT:**

Feedback to the unit on the results of the evaluation will then be provided to the Administrator and the unit by the Dean when the review is complete.

**DEAN’S REQUESTED MEETING:**

As part of each five-year administrator review, the faculty and staff may be asked by the dean   
to meet and to discuss administrative functions and procedures and generally review the administrator of the unit and make recommendations to the dean and to the department head or director.

**EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES:**

Under extraordinary circumstances such as gross misconduct in office, a special review can be activated at any time at the discretion of the Dean.

**TIMETABLE**:

1. February 1, the Dean’s Office determines which Academic Administrators are up for either a two-year or five-year review.
2. March 1, work with EMS IT to prepare the secure website to receive the new feedback
3. March 15, Dean’s Office e-mails to Academic Administrator constituency with link to secure website and instructions on how to provide their feedback.
4. April 15, all inputs from constituency are due to the Dean’s Office.
5. May 15, dean provides feedback and consolidated responses to the administrator via e-mail and requests they schedule an appointment to meet and discuss them as soon as feasible.
6. June 15, dean e-mails constituency to provide them with the feedback and results of the evaluation.
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