ICAS APPOINTEE REPORTING AND EVALUATION STRUCTURE

The following protocols apply to any appointee made by ICAS as a group or by ICAS Leadership. These protocols do not apply to appointees made by the individual segments represented on ICAS, even if that appointee serves on an intersegmental body.

Reporting
ICAS appointees are expected to communicate regularly to ICAS regarding their assignments. This communication should take place through contact with the ICAS chair and may normally take the form of written reports. The format and detail of these reports will be determined as appropriate for each assignment by the ICAS chair in consultation with the leadership of the other ICAS segments. Appointees are expected to be available to attend ICAS meetings for presentations at the request of the ICAS chair.

Appointment Process
When an appointment by ICAS is necessary, the three segment leaders from ICAS will agree on a process for selecting and screening candidates. ICAS as a group always retains the right to interview final candidates and make the selection; however, the selection of the appointee may be delegated to the segment chairs by a majority vote of ICAS members. All ICAS appointments that are delegated to the segment chairs are subject to ratification by the ICAS members.

Duration of Appointments
Unless otherwise indicated in contracts or other agreements, all appointments made by ICAS will be for two academic years.

Evaluation Process
During the second year of any appointment made by ICAS, the appointee will be evaluated by ICAS as a whole. This evaluation must be concluded by April of the second year of the appointment. The evaluation will consist of a review of the appointee’s performance in terms of both effectiveness and responsiveness to ICAS direction. The ICAS chair shall determine through consultation with the other ICAS segment chairs the specific structure of the evaluation and the information to be included as appropriate to the specific assignments.

At the conclusion of the appointee’s evaluation, ICAS shall determine the appointee’s performance to be satisfactory, in need of improvement, or unsatisfactory. The final decision regarding the appointee’s performance will be determined by majority vote of ICAS members.

Results of Evaluation
If the appointee’s performance is judged to be satisfactory, ICAS may extend the appointment for up to two additional years as appropriate. ICAS may also choose to issue commendations for the appointee’s performance.
If the appointee’s performance is judged to require improvement, ICAS may extend the appointment for up to one additional year. In such an instance, the appointee will be evaluated again during this additional year, and if sufficient improvement is not noted by ICAS then the performance of the appointee will be judged to be unsatisfactory.

If the appointee’s performance is judged to be unsatisfactory and the authority for the appointment is under ICAS’ purview, ICAS will take steps replace the appointee for the following year. If the appointee’s performance is judged to be unsatisfactory and the authority for the appointment is under the control of an external party, ICAS communicate its finding to the responsible party and request the removal of the appointee.