



Policies for Faculty Performance Review

The following University policies are to be applied in the conduct of faculty performance reviews:

- A. The performance of tenured faculty will be reviewed annually or, at the discretion of the dean, during the first year of each biennium with the rating applying for the biennium. Any tenured faculty employee, upon request, shall be granted an annual review.

The performance of non-tenured faculty will be reviewed annually. Special attention will be given to the evaluation of persons in their first year of employment to maximize effective guidance.

The educational unit administrator will review each faculty employee and recommend an evaluation rating to the dean of the college to which the educational unit is assigned. The performance of each faculty employee appointed in the extension title series will be reviewed by the educational unit administrator of the educational unit to which the individual is assigned and the dean of the college in which the individual's position is funded, using the evaluation instrument and appeal process of the college in which the individual's position is funded. For a faculty employee with a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, the educational unit administrator of the educational unit in which the faculty employee has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty employee, with input from the educational unit administrator of the educational unit in which the individual has a secondary appointment. If the secondary appointment comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, the faculty employee will be evaluated by the educational unit administrators in the primary department and the secondary department.

In a Graduate Center, the Center Director will review each faculty employee assigned to the center and recommend an evaluation rating to the Dean of the Graduate School. A faculty employee who has a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment in a center or institute comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, will be reviewed by the educational unit administrator of the educational unit in which the individual has a primary appointment, with input from the director of the respective center or institute. If the secondary appointment in a center or institute comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, then the individual will be evaluated in both the primary educational unit and the center or institute.

The performance of faculty on assignment in international programs or in other out-of-state programs shall be evaluated on the basis of their performances and accomplishments in their assigned areas of activity (see Section A of AR 3:4).

Exceptions to these performance review policies will apply in cases of (1) tenured faculty who will retire before or at the end of the current fiscal year, and (2) non-tenured faculty whose appointments will not be renewed.

1. A primary purpose of the performance review is individual and institutional self-improvement. To help in achieving this purpose, the performance review will determine for each faculty employee both a quantitative assessment and a qualitative judgment of the faculty employee's activities during the review period in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, University and public service, and other appropriate activities with relative weightings based on a prior agreement pertinent to the distribution of effort among any or all of these activities.
2. To serve this purpose, inputs from students, colleagues, and administrators are to be used. Teaching, advising, research, and service assignments must be evaluated in annual and biennial reviews and in appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure. The results of these evaluations shall be considered in the decisions concerning retention, promotion, and merit ratings of each faculty employee.

The assessment of teaching shall include the results of student appraisals for at least one semester per year, peer faculty appraisals based upon review of course syllabi, course materials, text, learning exercises, exams and in class presentation where applicable, and also other relevant information. Colleges, working through appropriate University bodies, shall develop some means to evaluate the quality as well as the quantity of academic advising done by each faculty employee. As this procedure is developed and implemented, the results of this evaluation shall be considered in the annual performance review. The extent and character of each faculty employee's teaching and advising should be documented by a body of supporting materials regularly maintained and updated by the faculty employee. Such documentation shall include a teaching portfolio as outlined in Appendix I.

3. Evaluation of Collaborative Efforts: The products of collaborative and multidisciplinary efforts in teaching, research, and service shall be evaluated. The faculty employee shall document the contribution he/she has made to the collective project. The appraisal of the faculty employee's effectiveness as part of the collaborative or multidisciplinary effort should include evaluation statements by the other employees of the team.
 4. The quantitative data are to be provided at least once annually by the faculty employee to the educational unit administrator through an instrument approved by the Provost..
 5. These data are to be supplemented by other inputs of the educational unit as pertinent.
- B. Reviews are to be based upon the distribution of effort performed by the faculty employee.
1. In any case for which an agreement on the distribution of effort has not been developed previously, the distribution of effort depicted by other approved instrument for the current year will be used.
 2. During the spring semester of each year, the educational unit administrator of each educational unit with advice from the faculty employees of the unit will develop an overall distribution of faculty time for approval by the dean of the college or next administrative officer. In any case of disagreement that is not readily resolved, the decision of the dean or next administrative officer will be final.
 3. A written agreement is to be developed annually between the educational unit administrator and the faculty employee on the distribution of effort expected of the faculty employee in major activities during the succeeding year. For any faculty employee who is or will be associated with a multidisciplinary research center or institute, the agreement shall be consistent with the conditions of establishment of the faculty position and signed by the faculty employee, director of the research center or institute, the educational unit administrator, and the dean. In case of lack of agreement on the distribution of effort, the next higher level of University administration will become involved in resolving any issues. In case of a significant change in the faculty employee's distribution of activities during the review period, an appropriately revised agreement is to be negotiated. An individual who is hired with the prospect of becoming a tenured faculty employee shall be assigned

duties by the educational unit administrator commensurate with making due progress toward meeting requirements for tenure. The annual performance review of each non-tenured faculty employee shall include some discussion with the educational unit administrator of the individual's progress toward consideration for tenure in terms of the educational unit's expectations.

4. The educational unit administrator shall consult with the tenured faculty employees of the educational unit regarding the progress of each non-tenured faculty employee toward consideration for tenure in terms of the educational unit's expectations. Consultation about a non-tenured faculty employee who has been or is on assignment in an international program or in some other out-of-state program shall include, if the individual is eligible to be considered for tenure, evaluations of the individual's performance and accomplishments in assigned areas of activities in such programs (refer to Sections A and D of AR 3:4). For each non-tenured faculty employee who is associated with any multidisciplinary research centers or institutes, the educational unit administrator also shall consult with the directors of the pertinent centers or institutes. These discussions should occur at the end of the non-tenured faculty employee's second and fourth years, but may occur more frequently at the educational unit administrator's discretion. The results of these discussions should be communicated to the individual non-tenured faculty employee and a record maintained in the faculty employee file.

C. Rankings or ratings are to be used.

1. At least three evaluative groupings are to be used, whether letter, numerical, or descriptive designations.
2. The rankings are to be designed to recognize both outstanding and unsatisfactory performances as well as those appraised as degrees of good or satisfactory. Each educational unit must develop a clear set of expectations for satisfactory performance linked to the distribution of effort agreement.

D. An appeals process is to be developed for both the college and the Provost levels.

1. After being considered in the college, an appeal can be addressed by the Provost.
2. An appeal emanating from a college shall be considered by a committee appointed by the Provost. After a hearing, the committee will make a recommendation to the Provost whose decision shall be final.

E. The Provost is assigned the responsibility for developing the procedures by which the policies for faculty performance review are to be implemented.

1. The colleges are the focal points to which the review procedures are delegated.
2. The dean of each college is responsible for the exercise of the procedures.

References and Related Materials

AR 3:4 Guidelines for Employment or Assignment of Faculty and Staff Related to Out-of-State Programs

Revision History

8/30/1988, 6/11/1992, 1/18/1996, 8/18/1998, 10/8/1999, 12/16/2000

For questions, contact: [Office of Legal Counsel](#)

Appendix I

Teaching Portfolio (University System)

A. Teaching Evaluation

The teaching portfolio is composed of a variety of materials related to teaching and advising collected and maintained by the faculty member. It serves as an instrument for review, evaluation, and improvement of teaching and advising. The teaching portfolio enables faculty to describe their teaching assignments, methods, and circumstances, which - of necessity - vary widely in a complex university environment. The portfolio concept encourages faculty to submit a variety of materials that describe, explain, and assess teaching, advising, and related activities. Just as publications, extramural grants, and peer evaluations testify to the nature and quality of a faculty member's research, materials contained in the portfolio document the nature and quality of a faculty member's teaching and advising.

The following items are required for documentation of teaching:

1. A brief reflective statement by the instructor which describes teaching and advising assignments, sets forth philosophies or objectives, and provides whatever information may be necessary to provide colleagues with a context for interpreting and understanding the other evaluative information.
2. For each semester under review, a list of all courses taught, with the title, course number, number of students enrolled, and - for each different course - a short description.
3. Representative course syllabi.
4. A quantitative and qualitative summary of student evaluations.

The following items are suggested but not required:

1. Materials prepared for teaching activities, such as assignments, exercises, handouts, examinations or other assessment materials.
2. Indicators of student learning: such as examples of graded work; reference to students who succeed in advanced courses of study and/or who earn academic awards; accomplishments of former students; evident of learning by use of pre-and post-testing procedures.
3. Evidence of peer regard: colleague class visitation reports; peer evaluations of course content, materials, assignments, and practices.
4. Documentation of teaching-related activity: curriculum and course development; consulting work; innovative teaching methods; participation in teaching programs of other units or at other universities.
5. Evidence of recognition: teaching related grants; publications related to teaching and advising; teaching awards and honors.
6. Enumeration and description of work with individual students: supervision of Honors students, graduate students, independent or experiential learning; consultation with students outside the department.

B. Advising Evaluation

Where advising is a portion of the faculty member's usual assignment, evaluation should include the extent of advising and its quality along with an indication of the grounds for evaluation.

The portfolio must include the following items:

1. A section of the reflective statement which describes the nature and extent of advising and any other information necessary to provide colleagues with a context for evaluation of advising.
2. For each semester under review, the number and level of undergraduate and graduate program advises, and a list of masters and doctoral students for whom the instructor served as a member of a thesis or advisory committee.
3. A list of those students for whom the professor served as preceptor, or director of a thesis or dissertation.
4. Summary of activities associated with student organizations and service on student-faculty committees.
5. Student evaluation of advising.

The following item is suggested but not required:

Evaluation of advising by unit colleagues or administrators.