

## **Policy on Annual Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty**

Nearly all faculty members perform their duties in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service at or above the expected level. Annual Performance Reviews will aid faculty members and university administrators to document this accomplishment. Annual Performance Reviews may also serve to identify truly superlative faculty performance and to identify faculty members who are experiencing difficulties in meeting their expectations. This policy outlines the principles guiding Annual Performance Reviews and some of the possible consequences of their outcomes.

This Policy on Annual Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty replaces the Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance [II-1.20(A)].

1. Faculty members should have a clear understanding of their unit's expectations for them in scholarship, teaching, and service. These expectations may vary from unit to unit, from faculty member to faculty member, and over the career of an individual faculty member. Expectations should take into account the strengths and development needs of the faculty member and the needs of the department and university. The unit head should make sure that faculty members are informed of their expectations, and that the unit provides a setting conducive to meeting them. In most cases, the setting of expectations will be routine, but if necessary, the faculty member and the unit head should work out the expectations together.
2. All tenured faculty are to have an Annual Performance Review to document that they are meeting their expectations in all areas. The review will be conducted within the faculty member's tenure home, by the Annual Review Committee, and should be based on generally accepted documentation of faculty accomplishment, as defined by the unit, such as the Faculty Activity Report (FAR), course evaluations by students, and the like. It is expected that the Annual Performance Review will inform the review for merit pay distribution and in most cases will coincide with it (see University Policy on Merit Pay Distribution [VII-4.00(a)]); the elected Salary Committee would then also serve as the Annual Review Committee. If the academic unit so chooses, it may develop a separate procedure for Annual Performance Reviews, with a separate Annual Review Committee, so long as the separate committee is elected and is representative of the tenured faculty. The new procedure must be approved by the unit's faculty in accordance with its Plan of Organization. The Annual Performance Review is the single-most important mechanism for assessing faculty performance and its significance goes beyond any financial compensation that may result from it. Therefore, the annual review of all tenured faculty should be conducted whether or not merit increases are available. (A review for promotion in rank may take the place of the Annual Performance Review.)
3. The Annual Review Committee gives the results of the reviews to the unit head, who conveys them to individual faculty members. Every faculty member should be informed of the result of his or her Annual Performance Review and should have an opportunity to respond to it.

4. A tenured faculty member whose performance in two consecutive Annual Performance Reviews has surpassed expectations in all areas by a wide margin, demonstrating extraordinary accomplishment, should be commended to the dean and the provost. The university should recognize and reward such sustained extraordinary faculty accomplishments either through existing awards and honors or through the development of new rewards, honors, privileges, or other forms of recognition. These recognitions should benefit deserving faculty members and should also showcase extraordinary faculty achievements to the university community and beyond.

5. If, in two consecutive Annual Performance Reviews, a faculty member's overall performance has been found to be substantially below reasonable and equitable expectations, the unit head must inform the faculty member of that finding. The letter should specify the deficiencies and propose a development plan outlining goals for improvement, suggesting ways that the improvement may be accomplished, and specifying the benchmarks whereby improvement can be assessed. The development plan should set a time period (usually until the next Annual Performance Review) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems.

The academic unit head (and/or a mentor appointed by the unit head in consultation with the faculty member) should work with the faculty member to improve performance during the time the development plan is in effect. The development plan, any attachments, and evidence of progress towards meeting its goals should be included in the next Annual Performance Review.

6. At the end of the period specified in the development plan, both the unit head and the Annual Review Committee should again review the faculty member's performance. If they again find that the performance is substantially below the expectations of the unit, the case will be referred to the dean (or provost, if the college is non-departmentalized) together with a recommendation for appropriate action. The notification to the dean (or provost) should include a report of the findings, specifying the deficiencies in performance. The faculty member will receive a copy of the notification and a report of findings, including the recommendation for appropriate action.

7. Recommendations for appropriate action after two consecutive reviews in which the faculty member is found to be substantially below expectations may include actions such as more intense efforts to improve weaknesses in performance, re-assignment of the faculty member's duties, or the reduction of travel funds or other privileges. In a very small percentage of cases the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as to no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate. Prior to implementing a salary reduction, the dean (or provost) shall appoint a 3-member Special Review Committee composed of tenured faculty at or above the rank of the faculty member and knowledgeable of the faculty member's discipline, but not of the same unit. The Special Review Committee shall consider the departmental report and may solicit

such other information from the unit and the university as it may consider important. The committee shall also offer the faculty member an opportunity to respond in person and/or in writing to the departmental report and recommendations. The committee shall provide the dean (or provost) its written recommendations concerning a salary reduction, including the amount and duration of any reduction it believes appropriate. The decision of the dean (or provost) shall be submitted to the provost (or president) for approval. If approved, it shall be communicated to the faculty member, together with a copy of the Special Review Committee=s recommendation.