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Date
Process for Public Service Technology Department Chair Review:

- Whereas, Article 10, Section 5 of the collective bargaining agreement between UA and AAUP-UA Chapter, requires the adoption and implementation of a formal performance review of a department chair seeking reappointment; and
- Whereas, the bargaining unit faculty, college dean and provost must approve said policy regarding chair review;
- Therefore, department chair review and reappointment shall be pursuant to the following policy which has been adopted by Public Service Technology bargaining unit faculty, and is pending final approval by the dean and provost.

"Department chairs are selected by the college dean in consult with the department’s bargaining unit faculty and provost. A chair’s term is discretionary with the dean but shall not exceed units of four (4) years. During the last year of a chair’s term, should the chair seek reappointment for another term, a formal performance review of the preceding term shall be conducted pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement and by the following policy:

1. By Friday of the 3rd week of the semester in which the chair’s term shall expire, the department’s bargaining unit faculty, acting as a committee of the whole, shall seek nominations and conduct an election, from among the bargaining unit faculty of the department, for two (2) departmental bargaining faculty to serve on the chair review committee. The dean and provost shall each appoint one (1) additional departmental bargaining unit faculty to the review committee.

2. The review committee shall select its own chair and transcriber. Minutes of all deliberations shall be approved by said committee and kept by the committee chair.

3. By Friday of the 5th week, the review committee will submit to all bargaining unit faculty an EVALUATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT CHAIR form to be completed by Friday of the 8th week. The confidentiality of the process will be preserved.

4. The review committee will provide individual department bargaining unit faculty with an opportunity to submit additional written qualitative and summative statements of their observations and opinions of the Chair’s performance by the end of the 7th week. To ensure the anonymity of such written qualitative and summary evaluations, the review committee will summarize the statements prior to forwarding same to the department chair and dean.

5. The summary of the results of the EVALUATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT CHAIR forms collected from departmental faculty and the summary of all other written qualitative and summative statements submitted by individual department bargaining unit faculty, including the review committee’s written report, will be forwarded to the department chair as soon as they are available.

6. The review committee’s written report and recommendation is due to the dean by Friday of the 10th week. After collecting and compiling the evaluation forms and collecting any additional written comments, the committee shall report their recommendation on whether the Department Chair should continue in this role. The
report shall note the recommendation of the committee, the compilation of the 
*EVALUATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT CHAIR 
forms*, and a summary of the individual bargaining unit members’ anonymous 
evaluations (see #4 above). Prior to the report being sent forward, an opportunity 
will be given for review and discussion by the faculty of the final report.

The dean shall conduct an independent review of the chair, and the results will be 
communicated to the chair. Should the chair determine not to continue as chair, the dean 
shall communicate this decision to the bargaining unit. Otherwise, the dean shall 
communicate to the bargaining unit the dean’s decision as to whether the individual will 
continue serving in the role of Department Chair for an additional term.
EVALUATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT CHAIR
COMPLETE THIS FORM AND RETURN TO:
THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE THE PUBLIC SERVICE TECHNOLOGY CHAIR
BY ____________________________
(the deadline date)

Each chair who is willing to serve another term is evaluated in the last year of his/her appointment. The purpose of this evaluation is to inform the Dean whether or not the department faculty members wish to retain the incumbent chair and to provide information regarding the incumbent’s strengths and weaknesses.

Your evaluation form is confidential; it will not be made available to the chair. Summaries are provided by the Dean without specific attribution.

CHAIR’S NAME ____________________________ DEPARTMENT ____________________________

1. Evaluator’s opinion of chairperson’s overall competence as the leader of the Department of Public Service Technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

2. Evaluator’s opinion of chair’s contributions to individual faculty development (providing useful and timely feedback in faculty evaluations, annual faculty reviews, dealing with sensitive personal matters, assisting with preparation of materials for tenure and/or promotion, merit, leaves, grants, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

3. The Dean of Summit College and the Chair establish departmental goals in consultation with the faculty. Evaluator’s opinion of chair’s efforts and success in supporting those goals and directions for the department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

4. Evaluator’s opinion of chair’s promotion of a collegial atmosphere including his/her willingness and ability to interact with, consult with, and respond to members of the faculty in matters of importance to the department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

5. Evaluator’s opinion of the chair’s communication skills and practices with faculty and staff of the Department of Public Service Technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

6. Evaluator’s opinion of chairperson’s overall competence as a spokesperson for the department to the College, University, and related disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

7. Additional observations.

Comment: 