

Report of 2009-10 College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

April 28, 2010

Members

Prof. Jacob Odgaard
Prof. David Rethwisch
Prof. David Andersen

Term Expiring

May 2010
May 2011
May 2012

General Charge

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the criteria for and the appropriateness of all recommendations concerning faculty promotions, tenure, and new appointments in the college and for making such recommendations to the dean and the faculty as it deems necessary.

Committee Questionnaire

To help prepare a response to the Charge, the Committee sent a questionnaire to the DEOs. The questionnaire, which is attached to this report, asks for a response to questions pertaining to the specific charges listed below. The DEOs were provided with a copy of the College of Engineering Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions.

The Committee also requested input from center and institute directors on Specific Charge No. 4.

Committee findings and recommendations are listed after each of the charges below.

Specific Charges

1. Review the procedures used for new appointments of tenure-track faculty in the College of Engineering during 2008-09. Advise the EFC as to whether these appointments complied with the College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations*.

Committee Finding:

Seven new appointments, in four departments, were made during 2008-09. The DEOs report that all appointments complied with the College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations*.

2. College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions* state that in a promotion and tenure review:

(i). “A closed ballot vote of the DCG members attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting” and that “After taking into account the recommendations of the DCG and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in a review of the promotion/ tenure file and/or the meeting of the DCG when the final recommendation was made, to transmit an independent recommendation to the Dean ... and to indicate in the transmittal letter the vote of the DCG and the results of consultations with those named above.”

(ii). It is highly desirable that the DCG meeting at which the final vote is taken be held at a time when all DCG members can attend. The DCG chair shall give at least one week’s notice of this meeting, unless an earlier meeting with full attendance is possible.

(iii). In 2008-09 the EFC gave the following guidance on voting: participation by members of the DCG via conference call is appropriate but that any voting must be anonymous. One possible way to make the vote anonymous would be to have the person that would participate by phone leave two ballots, one yes, one no, each in an envelope inside another envelop. The appropriate vote could then be done by having the person designate which envelop contains the official vote.

Determine departmental practices with respect to the procedures and EFC guidance listed above. Recommend any changes that are needed.

Committee Finding:

All departments report that the practices listed in 2(i), 2(ii), and 2(iii) are followed and that they work well. No changes are suggested.

3. Observation by peers of classroom teaching. The College policy requires peer observation of teaching (POT) in a minimum of three sessions for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Report on the adherence to this policy in the following situations:

(1) a tenured associate professor being reviewed for promotion to full professor for whom at least three POT sessions were conducted earlier for an promotion/tenure decision,

(2) an assistant professor being reviewed for tenure/promotion to associate professor for whom at least three POT sessions were conducted earlier for reappointment, and

(3) an assistant professor with a three-year initial appointment is reviewed for reappointment.

Advise the EFC whether any change(s) to the procedures is needed.

Committee Finding:

The DEOs of all four departments that hired during 2008-09 report that they adhered to the College Policy (POT in a minimum of three sessions for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review) in the three situations listed. One department exceeded the minimum.

All departments agree that no changes are needed. One DEO suggests that the timing of the POT sessions not be specified in the document but be agreed upon between the DEO, DCG, and the candidate.

4. Recommend procedures to use for reappointment of Directors of Centers and Institutes in the College.

Committee Finding:

Four DEOs favor procedures similar to those approved for reappointment of DEOs. One of the DEOs emphasizes that regular/permanent staff of the respective Center/Institute must be included in the procedure. One DEO suggests that appointment be by the dean and he/she should use whatever procedures best fit the situation.

The committee solicited feedback from current center/institute directors. The feedback is appended to this document.

Committee Recommendation:

The committee has reviewed the procedure statement proposed by the EFC. In view of feedback from DEOs and center/institute directors, the committee recommends the procedure statement proposed by the EFC be modified to read:

The procedures pertaining to the reappointment of Directors of Center and Institutes in the College of Engineering should follow the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs in the College. In using these procedures it is expected that some members with voting rights in a Center or Institute will not hold regular faculty appointments. Such members must be considered in forming the review committee (cf. Section d of the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs) and anonymous evaluation (cf. Section f(2) of the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs). In using the procedures, Section d of the Procedures for Reappointment of DEOs should be changed to read:

(d) Review Committee Membership. A review committee (hereinafter the “committee”) shall be organized to compile information and make recommendations to aid in the overall assessment of the Director. The composition of the committee will be determined by the Dean. It should reflect the composition of constituents of the center/institute. For example, for a center/institute with more staff members than faculty with voting rights,

the committee should include more staff members than faculty. The Dean will ask the center/institute faculty and staff to nominate members to serve on the review committee. From the nominees, the Dean will select a representative review committee.

5. In 2008-09 the CoE Faculty adopted a procedure to use when a DEO of a department cannot provide a review of faculty member. Report on the instances of the application of this procedure if used in 2008-09.

The procedure adopted by the CoE Faculty in 2008-09 is the following.

When the DEO of a department cannot provide a review of a faculty member, a Departmental Consultant Group (DCG) is assembled in consultation with the Dean in the spring semester of the academic year before the review. At its first meeting, the DCG will recommend, by vote, a member of the group to act as the DEO designate (acting in place of the DEO) for the particular promotion case at hand. The recommendation of the DEO designate will be subject to approval by the Dean and Provost. The DEO designate shall not participate in the DCG deliberations for the particular case. The DEO designate will handle all of the duties usually handled by the DEO, including providing communication and feedback to the faculty member being evaluated for promotion and/ or granting tenure, soliciting external letters of reference, etc. This process should be initiated in the spring semester of the academic year before the review so the DEO designate is in place to handle the early stages of the review process.

Committee Finding:

The procedure was used in BME in the 2008-09 AY.

Additional comments from DEOs:

DEO 1: The Procedures document is poorly organized and does not cite the University of Iowa Critical document. This is really a problem and makes it difficult for the DEO to follow all the rules of both the college and the University. The CoE Procedures document should be replaced with a more plainly written and well-cited document. A flow diagram or checklist would also be nice.

DEO 2: It seems to me that compliance of procedure, e.g., Specific Charge # 2 and 3, should be matter of administrative concern. The P&T Committee Specific Charges probably best stay within what is defined by the General Charge.

Attachment 1

Charges for 2009-10 College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

<u>Members</u>	<u>Term Expiring</u>
Prof. Jacob Odgaard	May 2010
Prof. David Rethwisch	May 2011
Prof. David Andersen	May 2012

General Charge

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the criteria for and the appropriateness of all recommendations concerning faculty promotions, tenure, and new appointments in the college and for making such recommendations to the dean and the faculty as it deems necessary.

Our Committee would appreciate input from your department (The Department of _____) on the specific charges listed below. Please respond where indicated below each charge. Thank you very much.

Specific Charges

1. Review the procedures used for new appointments of tenure-track faculty in the College of Engineering during 2008-09. Advise the EFC as to whether these appointments complied with the College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations*.

Were there any such new appointments in your department during 2008-09?

If yes, how many new appointments did you have?

If yes, were the College procedures complied with?

2. College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions* state that in a promotion and tenure review:

(i). "A closed ballot vote of the DCG members attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting" and that "After taking into account the recommendations of the DCG and after consulting, if feasible, members of the

department who did not participate in a review of the promotion/ tenure file and/or the meeting of the DCG when the final recommendation was made, to transmit an independent recommendation to the Dean ... and to indicate in the transmittal letter the vote of the DCG and the results of consultations with those named above.”

(ii). It is highly desirable that the DCG meeting at which the final vote is taken be held at a time when all DCG members can attend. The DCG chair shall give at least one week’s notice of this meeting, unless an earlier meeting with full attendance is possible.

(iii). In 2008-09 the EFC gave the following guidance on voting: participation by members of the DCG via conference call is appropriate but that any voting must be anonymous. One possible way to make the vote anonymous would be to have the person that would participate by phone leave two ballots, one yes, one no, each in an envelope inside another envelop. The appropriate vote could then be done by having the person designate which envelop contains the official vote.

Determine departmental practices with respect to the procedures and EFC guidance listed above. Recommend any changes that are needed.

What are the practices in your department?

Would you recommend any changes to the EFC guidance given above?

3. Observation by peers of classroom teaching. The College policy requires peer observation of teaching (POT) in a minimum of three sessions for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Report on the adherence to this policy in the following situations:

(1) a tenured associate professor being reviewed for promotion to full professor for whom at least three POT sessions were conducted earlier for an promotion/tenure decision,

(2) an assistant professor being reviewed for tenure/promotion to associate professor for whom at least three POT sessions were conducted earlier for reappointment, and

(3) an assistant professor with a three-year initial appointment is reviewed for reappointment.

Advise the EFC whether any change(s) to the procedures is needed.

Please indicate whether your department adhered to the College policy (POT in a minimum of three sessions for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review) in the three situations listed above:

Please suggest changes to the policy/procedure if deemed necessary:

4. Recommend procedures to use for reappointment of Directors of Centers and Institutes in the College.

The Committee recommends adopting procedures similar to those approved for reappointment of DEOs. Do you agree? If not, what changes would you like to propose?

5. In 2008-09 the CoE Faculty adopted a procedure to use when a DEO of a department cannot provide a review of faculty member. Report on the instances of the application of this procedure if used in 2008-09.

The procedure adopted by the CoE Faculty in 2008-09 is the following.

When the DEO of a department cannot provide a review of a faculty member, a Departmental Consultant Group (DCG) is assembled in consultation with the Dean in the spring semester of the academic year before the review. At its first meeting, the DCG will recommend, by vote, a member of the group to act as the DEO designate (acting in place of the DEO) for the particular promotion case at hand. The recommendation of the DEO designate will be subject to approval by the Dean and Provost. The DEO designate shall not participate in the DCG deliberations for the particular case. The DEO designate will handle all of the duties usually handled by the DEO, including providing communication and feedback to the faculty member being evaluated for promotion and/ or granting tenure, soliciting external letters of reference, etc. This process should be initiated in the spring semester of the academic year before the review so the DEO designate is in place to handle the early stages of the review process.

Was this procedure used in your department?

Please use the rest of this page to provide general comments and recommendations pertaining to the charges to our committee. Thank you.

Would you agree to let us append this document (with your responses) to our Committee Report to the EFC? If we do not hear back from you, we'll assume the answer is YES.

Attachment 2

Jacob,

I think that Karim has captured the process accurately below. During my reappointment input was sought from all the faculty, research and administrative staff. I do not believe that any external input was gathered, but could be an element of the review process.

Please let me know if you have any specific questions.

Larry

-----Original Message-----

From: Karim Malek [<mailto:amalek@engineering.uiowa.edu>]

Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2010 10:48 AM

To: Jacob Odgaard

Cc: Weber, Larry J; thomas casavant; David Rethwisch; david andersen

Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: Procedures for Reappointment of Institute and Center Directors]

Hi Jacob,

Sorry for not responding earlier.

Here is what I know:

There are two types of reviews:

(1) appointment review conducted by the Dean. This is typically a committee appointed by the Dean and includes faculty and staff. I believe in the past only research staff were included. I do believe that all types of staff should be included. These reviews would be conducted through meetings, questionnaires, and oneon one.

(2) FPoA

These are done internally, a report is generated, and is provided to the Administrator. That committee was only faculty and Research Engineers.

Hope this is what you are looking for.

Thanks,

Karim

Jacob,
No significant comments from me.

Tom

Jacob Odgaard wrote:

Tom:

Please find attached the College of Engineering Procedures for Reappointment of Department Executive Officers (as listed on the web). The document includes an EFC motion on Procedures for Reappointment of Directors of Centers and Institutes. Please review these procedures and let us know (by March 12) if you agree or recommend changes. If you recommend changes, please specify. Thank you very much.

Jacob

--
--

It doesn't take a genius to know you better be there - Lance Armstrong

=====
| Professor Thomas L. Casavant, Ph.D.
| Roy J. Carver, Jr. Chair in Bioinformatics and
| Computational Biology
| Director: UI Center for Bioinformatics
| and Computational Biology (CBCB)
| Coordinator: Interdisciplinary Graduate Program
| in Bioinformatics
| Associate Director/Bioinformatics: Holden Cancer Center
| Depts. of Electrical and Computer Engr,
| Biomedical Engr, and Ophthalmology & Visual Sci
| Member: Genetics Ph.D. Program Faculty,
| Applied Math and Computational Sci. Pgm, and
| Coordinated Lab. for Computational Genomics
| University of Iowa
| Iowa City, IA 52242 (USA)
| 319-335-5953 (V) 319-384-0944 (F)
| email: tomc@eng.uiowa.edu
| URL <http://www.eng.uiowa.edu/~tomc/>
=====



April 4, 2010

Dr. Jacob Odgaard
Professor
Civil and Environmental Engineering
The University of Iowa

Dear Jacob,

Thank you for requesting my feedback regarding the new criteria for reviewing DEOs and Directors.

I have the following comments to make. The statement appended to the document as stated is: "Such individuals should also be considered in forming the review committee (cf. Section d of the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs) and anonymous evaluation (cf. Section f(2) of the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs)." This statement falls short of a major inclusion of staff members in the review process.

My comments are from a Center/Institute perspective.

Item (d.) The size of the committee may vary, but, the majority of the members of the Committee shall be faculty members with their primary appointments in the Department and include, at a minimum, at least one faculty member from outside the Department and three faculty members from the Department. The Dean will ask the departmental faculty to nominate faculty, and if applicable staff, to serve on the review committee. From the nominees, the Dean will select a representative review committee.

I have two comments:

A. Broad staff inclusion

This item should be far more clear than simply including faculty. While faculty members are the primary drive force behind a center's success, staff of all types and classifications are also heavily involved in achieving the Center's goals and objectives. In today's center operations, at least at CCAD, there are no longer primary and secondary affiliations. The Center is driven by a free enterprise, where faculty and senior staff can pursue large scale projects. Staff constitute the majority of the Center. Their voice is must be counted in evaluating the Director. For example, 90% of NADS and about 50% of VSR (the largest units within CCAD) are staff.

Staff are classified into the following categories:

- a. Director/assistant director (e.g., Omar Ahmad, Assistant Director at NADS and Steve Beck, Senior R&D Manager at CCAD)
- b. Research Scientists (e.g., Dr. Tim Marler at VSR)
- c. Research Engineers (e.g., Dr. Yujian Xian and Dr. Rajan Bhatt at VSR)
- d. Programmer/analyst (e.g., Kim Farrell at CCAD)
- e. Staff Engineer (e.g., Jeff Dolan, Engineer IV)
- f. Technical staff (e.g., Cat Mize, NADS operator and Corey Kreutz, mechanic)
- g. Program assistants
- h. Secretary

Recommendation: The document should be revised to create an equitable balance between staff and faculty as being the constituents of the Center, not simply a statement appended to the document. The Committee should comprise of an appropriate contingency of the staff and faculty with specific language addressing staff in the document.

B. Departmental faculty

Because affiliation policies have not worked in the past, CCAD has changed its model of operation. In principle, anyone from around campus who wishes to work with CCAD can do so. There are no primary or secondary affiliations. The Center comprises of six (6) Research Units, each having a director, staff, and students. Criteria for establishing a unit are in place. As a result of this, the idea of “center faculty” is difficult to pin point. To put this in context, CCAD has grown to over 150 personnel. The six Directors of the units are the ones that meet with the Center Director on a regular basis, but they in turn are responsible for engaging associated faculty. The Director of a Research unit is not necessarily a faculty member. The document refers to “primary appointments”, which no longer exist. The document refers to voting rights, which no longer applies. The CCAD Administrative Council (CAC) is a committee that makes major decisions for the Center.

Recommendation: The document should be revised to address the type of makeup of a center or institute given no affiliation policies but rather its constituents and Council.

I submit this to you in writing but offer my willingness to meet with the committee to further explain my comments and how the Center is operationally functional.

Thank you again for requesting my feedback.

Sincerely,

Karim Abdel-Malek, PhD
Director, Center for Computer-Aided Design
Professor, Biomedical Engineering
Professor, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

**EFC Motion on Procedures for Reappointment of Department Executive Officers and
Directors of Centers and Institutes**

The EFC moves: *that the procedures outlined in the attached documents entitled “College of Engineering Procedures for Reappointment of Department Executive Officers” and “College of Engineering Procedures for Reappointment of Directors of Centers and Institutes” be adopted effective AY 2008-09.*

College of Engineering Procedures for Reappointment of Department Executive Officers

The procedures described in this section pertain to reappointment of Department Executive Officer (DEO) in the College of Engineering.

- (a) Purpose: A review of a DEO at the end of a term of appointment to:
 - (1) develop a meaningful basis for the decision about whether or not to reappoint a DEO,
 - (2) enhance administrative performance of the DEO,
 - (3) improve accountability of the DEO to appropriate constituencies, and
 - (4) help achieve greater communication across all levels of the university about program goals and their implementation.

- (b) Timing: The review shall be conducted prior to the expiration of the appointment of the DEO and allowing adequate time for a substantive review.

- (c) Responsibilities:
 - (1) The individual responsible for initiating the review is the Dean of the College of Engineering (hereinafter called the Dean).
 - (2) The DEO shall be responsible for preparing for the Dean and the review committee a self-assessment of his or her performance during the period under review. The self-assessment shall take into account recommendations of prior reviews if applicable, the goals and mission, and, if applicable, the most recent strategic plan of the DEO's Department (hereinafter called the Department). The DEO's self-assessment shall be delivered to the Dean before the review committee is appointed.
 - (3) The review committee shall work with the Dean to prepare an assessment tool (e.g., web survey) for the review.
 - (4) The review committee shall be responsible for gathering any additional information that it thinks necessary to prepare an assessment of the administrator's performance.

- (d) Review Committee Membership. A review committee (hereinafter the "committee") shall be organized to compile information and make recommendations to aid in the overall assessment of the DEO. The composition of the committee will be determined by the Dean. The size of the committee may vary, but, the majority of the members of the Committee shall be faculty members with their primary appointments in the Department and include, at a minimum, at least one faculty member from outside the

Department and three faculty members from the Department. The Dean will ask the departmental faculty to nominate faculty, and if applicable staff, to serve on the review committee. From the nominees, the Dean will select a representative review committee.

(e) Scope. The committee shall evaluate the DEO's performance within each of the following areas, taking into account the degree to which each area relates to the DEO's responsibilities. The committee should consult with the Dean in identifying those aspects of the following areas that are most pertinent to assessing the DEO's performance:

(1) Goal formation and attainment. Has the administrator taken a leadership role in formulating appropriate goals for the office or unit, reflecting awareness of educational and professional trends, and has he or she consulted with faculty of the Department in the process of doing so? If goals were agreed upon at the beginning of the period under review, to what degree have those goals been attained?

(2) Scholarship. Does the DEO encourage scholarship among the faculty and does he/she create an environment that fosters and encourages scholarly pursuits? Does he or she recognize excellence in scholarship?

(3) Educational leadership. How well does the Department fulfill its educational mission? How effective is the DEO in stimulating discussion of new ideas about teaching and in encouraging and guiding promising developments through to implementation? Has the DEO helped to provide an environment within the Department and between the Department and other parts of the University that enhances the educational efforts of faculty and students? Does the DEO establish a congenial educational environment?

(4) Personnel management. Does the DEO show concern for and zeal in recruiting or encouraging the recruiting of the highest quality new appointments available? How well does the DEO do in choosing, evaluating, and supervising subordinates reporting directly to him or her? How well does the DEO's office perform in general?

(5) Resource management. Does the DEO seek to obtain resources that are adequate to enable the Department to achieve its full academic potential, and does he or she arrange for appropriate support services for the Department?

(6) Relationships among constituencies. Does the DEO establish and enhance good working relationships with faculty, staff, students, external constituencies, and those other administrators with whom the DEO regularly interacts?

(7) Planning and policy making. Does the DEO: 1) involve the faculty and other relevant constituencies in planning and policy making; 2) provide opportunities for consultation through individual and group meetings; and 3) provide information (with the exception of information to which access is restricted by

other policies) in a timely, full, and open manner to facilitate effective participation in planning and policy making?

(8) Human rights and diversity. Does the DEO provide effective leadership in the implementation of University policies relating to human rights and diversity, including policies on affirmative action?

(9) Promoting constructive innovation. Does the DEO encourage constructive suggestions for new goals or programs, or new ways for accomplishing ongoing goals more effectively?

(10) Scope of leadership. Has the DEO demonstrated knowledge of developments and educational leadership beyond his or her Department, including campus wide leadership and leadership at the state or national level, as appropriate to his or her responsibilities?

(f) Procedures.

(1) The committee shall devise mechanisms for obtaining information and evaluations from relevant faculty, staff, and students with regard to the relevant performance areas identified in section (e). The chair of the committee will consult with the Dean concerning the mechanisms to be used, and the identity of any other constituencies from which information or evaluative statements should be solicited.

(2) In partial fulfillment of its duties under the preceding paragraph, the Committee shall collect, through a questionnaire, anonymous faculty evaluations of the administrator. The questions will be informed by the categories of administrative performance listed in section (e) to the extent that they are relevant. The faculty questions will conform to the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) below, while the form and content of the questions directed at staff and students will be within the committee's discretion.

(a) Faculty respondents will be instructed to circle their responses for a single category/number on the following scale: *No Chance to Observe / 1 Strongly Disagree / 2 Disagree / 3 Agree / 4 Strongly Agree*. Each question will also provide an opportunity for a qualitative narrative response.

(b) At a minimum, the faculty questionnaire shall ask respondents to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with the following five statements (the "core questions"):

(i) The DEO has my trust and respect. [1 / 2 / 3 / 4]

(ii) The DEO does a good job in discharging the teaching mission of the unit. [*No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4*]

(iii) The DEO does a good job in promoting the quantity and quality of faculty scholarship. [*No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4*]

(iv) Overall, the DEO is effective. [*No chance to observe / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4*]

(v) The DEO should be re-appointed for another term. [*Yes / No*]

(g) Review Report.

(1) Preparation. The Committee is responsible for assembling the information obtained from faculty, staff, and students; listing strengths and weaknesses of the DEO and formulating conclusions. It shall compile a preliminary report containing this information, and the conclusions which shall be confidential.

(2) Opportunity for Response. Upon completing its report, the committee shall transmit the report to the Dean who shall provide the DEO with a complete copy and permit the DEO to prepare a written response within 30 days.

(3) After receiving the DEO's response, if any, the Committee will finalize the report within two weeks.

(4) Informing faculty. After receiving the final report assembled under this section and in consultation with the review committee, the Dean shall transmit the substance of the committee's evaluation to the constituent faculty. Transmission to the faculty shall be within two weeks of the receipt of the committee's report. In transmitting the results of the faculty questionnaire, the Dean shall report the response rate (the number and the proportion of the constituent faculty completing the questionnaire) and the aggregate responses (mean, standard deviation, median, and specific distribution) to each question posed to the faculty in the questionnaire, subject to the following limitations:

(a) If the Dean decides not to reappoint the DEO, or the DEO elects not to seek reappointment, it will be solely within the Dean's discretion which of the aggregate responses, if any, are reported to the faculty.

(b) Responses to the five core questions as defined in paragraph f(2)(b) above must be reported to the constituent faculty. The Dean has discretion to share or not share the specific responses to the other questions provided the Dean gives the faculty a summary of the strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation.

(c) In every case, the Dean shall consult with the review committee concerning the transmission of the substance of the review committee's report to appropriate constituencies other than faculty, such as students and staff.

(h) Decision on reappointment of the DEO. In the event the dean's recommendation differs from the majority of the answers to question (v) of section (f)(2)(b) the dean shall report the reasons to the Department faculty and the Provost and the Executive Vice President of the University.

College of Engineering Procedures for Reappointment of Directors of Centers and Institutes

The procedures pertaining to the reappointment of Directors of Centers and Institutes in the College of Engineering should follow the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs in the College. In using these procedures it is expected that some members with voting rights and primary appointment in a Center or Institute may not hold regular faculty appointments. Such individuals should also be considered in forming the review committee (cf. Section d of the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs) and anonymous evaluation (cf. Section f(2) of the Procedures for the Reappointment of DEOs).