



## ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATE

**FROM:** Bruce C. Bongarten, Provost and  
Vice President for Academic Affairs      **DATE:** 10/1/10  
**VOL.** 2010      **NO.** 6

**TO:** Department Chairs and Director of Library

---

**SUBJECT:** Academic Staff Evaluation Procedures for Personnel Action  
Recommendations – 2010-11

---

This Administrative Update outlines the process whereby faculty in academic rank<sup>1</sup> may be considered for the following personnel actions:

- Reappointment
- Continuing Appointment
- Promotion

Note that the draft college-wide guidelines for promotion and tenure currently under review are not in effect for 2010-11 evaluation cycle.

### Eligibility for Review

#### **Reappointment:**

- Faculty members whose term appointment will conclude between May 2011 and April 2012 and are not applying for Continuing Appointment must be reviewed for Reappointment in the review cycle covered by this communication if they wish to be considered for employment at academic rank at ESF beyond one additional year.
- Human Resources will provide to Department Chairs a list of faculty members whose terms will conclude between May 2011 and April 2012.

#### **Continuing Appointment:**

- Faculty members at the rank of **Assistant Professor, Instructor, Senior Assistant Librarian or Assistant Librarian** who will conclude six (6) years of faculty service<sup>2</sup> at ESF between May 2011 and April 2012 must be reviewed for Continuing Appointment in the review cycle covered by this communication if they wish to be considered for employment at academic rank in the SUNY system beyond seven years of service.
- Faculty members at the rank of **Professor, Associate Professor, Librarian or Associate Librarian** who will conclude two (2) years of faculty service at ESF between May 2011 and April 2012 must be reviewed for Continuing Appointment in the review cycle covered by this communication if they wish to be considered for employment at academic rank in the SUNY system beyond three years of service.

- **Assistant Professors** not holding continuing appointment with fewer than six (6) years of faculty service<sup>2</sup> may be considered for Continuing Appointment in the review cycle covered by this communication if they concurrently apply for and receive promotion to the Associate Professor rank.
- Any **Professor** or **Associate Professors** not holding continuing appointment may be considered for Continuing Appointment in the review cycle covered by this communication.

#### **Promotion:**

- Under normal circumstances, **Assistant Professors** should be reviewed for promotion in the review cycle covered by this communication if they will conclude six (6) years of qualifying faculty service<sup>2</sup> at ESF between May 2011 and April 2012.
- Based on a record of meritorious academic accomplishments, Department Chairs may invite faculty members to apply for promotion to the next highest rank.
- Faculty members may request to be considered for promotion to the next highest rank.

#### **Evaluation Criteria**

All evaluations should be based on, but not necessarily limited to, the following areas identified in the SUNY Promotion and Tenure guidelines:

1. Mastery of subject matter--as demonstrated by such things as advanced degrees, licenses, honors, awards, and reputation in a subject matter field.
2. Effectiveness in teaching--as demonstrated by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials or new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation.
3. Scholarly ability--as demonstrated by such things as success in developing and carrying out significant research work in the subject matter field, contribution to the arts, publication and reputation among colleagues.
4. Effectiveness of university service--as demonstrated by such things as college and University public service, committee work, administrative work and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships.
5. Continuing growth--as demonstrated by such things as reading, research or other activities to keep abreast of current developments in the academic employee's field and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility.

#### **Candidate Dossier and Evaluative File**

The candidate will prepare a dossier containing the following materials: (1) the candidate's Annual Reports since the time of appointment or since the last promotion, (2) the candidate's curriculum vitae, and (3) other documents prescribed in unit promotion and tenure guidelines.

The Evaluative File, upon which the candidate's credentials will be judged, contains (1) the candidate's dossier, (2) solicited internal and external letters of evaluation (hereafter referred to as "solicited materials"), and (3) recommendations from the Peer Review Committee, the Unit Head and the Provost, as they are made.

#### **Peer Review Committee**

The Unit Head will appoint a Peer Review Committee to: (1) Solicit external and internal letters of evaluation for candidates for continuing appointment and promotion, and (2) Provide a

recommendation to the Unit Head on the candidate's qualifications for the personnel action(s) under consideration (reappointment, continuing appointment, and/or promotion).

The Peer Review Committee will be comprised of faculty members in the unit senior<sup>3</sup> to the individual under consideration supplemented with similarly ranked members of the College faculty as prescribed in unit peer review procedures.

### **Solicited Materials**

College policy requires that reviews for continuing appointment and promotion include at least two evaluations and recommendations by reviewers from outside the College selected by the peer review committee from a roster supplied by the employee. Additional external reviewers to be solicited may be identified by the Peer Review Committee and/or the Department Chair. The Department Chair is encouraged to make his/her views known to the peer review committee on desirable supplemental external reviewers. The following procedures must be used when the Peer Review Committee solicits written evaluations and recommendation for an academic employee under consideration for continuing appointment, reappointment or promotion (Article 31 of the New York State - UUP Agreement):

1. Include the "Solicited Materials Form" with all requests for evaluations from internal and external reviewers.
2. Solicited Materials forms will be forwarded to the Unit Head under separate cover by the Office of the Provost.
3. Develop and maintain a roster of the individuals solicited; retain copies of all requests for peer evaluation.
4. Staple completed Solicited Materials forms to the respective materials returned.
5. Solicited evaluations may be shared with a candidate only when the evaluator has indicated so on the Solicited Materials Form. If no form is returned with the evaluation, it is presumed that the reviewer has not authorized the sharing of materials with the candidate.
6. In no event will materials that are both unsolicited and unsigned be made a part of any evaluation and recommendation process.

### **Review Process**

The Evaluative File, composed at the outset of the review process of the candidate's dossier and solicited internal and external materials, will be reviewed by a unit Peer Review Committee. Based on the contents of the Evaluative File, the Peer Review Committee will draft a recommendation supporting or opposing the personnel action under consideration. The Committee's recommendation will be added to the Evaluative File. The Evaluative File will then be forwarded to the Unit Head.

Upon receipt from the Peer Review Committee, the Unit Head will review the Evaluative File and draft a recommendation that will be added to the Evaluative File prior to the Provost's review. The Unit Head will provide a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate when it is forwarded to the Provost.

The Provost will review the Evaluative File and draft a recommendation that will be added to the Evaluative File prior to the President's review. The Provost will provide a copy of his recommendation to the candidate.

Following receipt of the Provost's recommendation, candidates will have one week to examine their Evaluative File and, if they so choose, submit a response. Candidate responses will be added to their Evaluative file. For the purpose of candidate review, solicited materials will be removed from the Evaluative File unless the author has given explicit permission for the materials to be seen by the

candidate (as prescribed in the Solicited Materials section above). Candidates wishing to review their evaluative file may contact Timothy Blehar in the Human Resources Office.

After the period for candidate review of the Evaluative File has expired, the College President will review the Evaluative File. Final decisions on personnel actions will be made by the President and communicated to the candidate and his/her Unit Head as soon as practical.

### **Timeline**

1 October 2010:

- Human Resources provides to Department Chairs and the Director of the Library (hereafter called Unit Heads) rosters of faculty members that must be reviewed for Continuing Appointment in upcoming review cycle.

7 October 2010:

- Unit Heads notify (in writing) faculty members who must be reviewed for Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle of same, and notify (in writing) all departmental faculty members of the deadline to apply for review for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle.

1 November 2010:

- Faculty member requests to be considered for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle due to the Unit Head. A list of prospective external reviewers (minimum of six) must accompany the request.

7 November 2010:

- Departmental rosters of candidates to be reviewed for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle due to Provost (from Unit Heads).

4 January 2011:

- Candidates' dossiers due to Peer Review Committee for review; Peer evaluations of teaching due to Peer Review Committee.

11 January 2011:

- Peer Review Committees (or Unit Heads acting at the behest of the Peer Review Committee) solicit letters from external and internal peer evaluators for candidates for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.

15 February 2011:

- External and internal peer evaluations due to Peer Review Committee. Peer Review Committee begins review of candidate Evaluative Files.

21 February 2011 (optional):

- Peer Review Committee meets with department faculty at or above status sought by the candidate to discuss the candidate's case for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.

28 February 2011:

- Evaluations by department faculty at or above status sought by the candidate due to the Peer Review Committee.

7 March 2011:

- Peer Review Committee recommendations and other Evaluative File materials due to Unit Heads.

14 March 2011:

- Unit Heads' recommendations and other Evaluative File materials due to Provost. Candidates receive a copy of the Unit Head recommendation.

15 March to 28 March 2011:

- Provost interviews candidates for Continuing Appointment.

29 March 2011:

- Provost's recommendations and other Evaluative File materials due to the College President. Candidates receive a copy of the Provost's recommendation. Candidates are invited to review evaluative file and comment prior to Presidential review.

8 April 2011:

- Presidential review begins.

-----  
<sup>1</sup> "Faculty in academic rank" is defined as incumbents who hold the titles of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Librarian, Associate Librarian, Senior Assistant Librarian, and Assistant Librarian.

<sup>2</sup> "Faculty service" includes up to three years Service Credit that may have been granted at appointment. Article XI of the SUNY Board of Trustees Policies ([http://www.suny.edu/board\\_of\\_trustees/PDF/Policies.pdf](http://www.suny.edu/board_of_trustees/PDF/Policies.pdf)) provides additional details on faculty service. Human Resources is responsible for tracking the years of qualifying faculty service.

<sup>3</sup> In reviews for continuing appointment the term senior refers to faculty already on continuing appointment, whereas, in reviews for promotion the term senior refers to faculty having academic rank at equal or higher academic rank than that for which the individual is to be considered.

Copy: C.B. Murphy, Jr., President  
T. Blehar, HR Assistant Director