



University of Kentucky
Office of the Provost

105 Main Building
Lexington, KY 40506
P: 859-257-2911
F: 859-257-1333
www.uky.edu

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans, Chairs and Directors

From: Timothy S. Tracy, Ph.D. 
Provost

Re: 2017-18 Faculty Performance Review: Second Year of Biennium

Date: July 25, 2017

The evaluation of faculty performance is one of the most important activities that educational unit administrators, working in close collaboration with deans and others, are asked to undertake. The purpose of the Faculty Performance Review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development and advancement. When done properly, the evaluation process is an effective means of communicating expectations, enhancing faculty productivity and having those accomplishments acknowledged and rewarded, as well as identifying and dealing with performance-related issues in the spirit of continuous improvement. In addition, faculty performance reviews are an important source of information for promotion and tenure reviews. *Administrative Regulation 3:10* (“[Policies for Faculty Performance Review](#)”) enumerates the policies and procedures for conducting performance evaluation of faculty at the University of Kentucky. This memo provides a brief summary of those [policies and procedures](#).

Please forward this memorandum to all full-time faculty employees in your unit.

Which faculty cohorts are being reviewed this year?

This being the second year of the current biennium, all full-time faculty employees across all title series shall undergo faculty performance evaluation, except tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers in those colleges that conduct biennial reviews of those faculty. *All* full-time faculty employees in their first year of service at the University of Kentucky must also undergo faculty performance review this year, independent of their title series, academic rank or tenure status.

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

If agreed to by mutual consent of the dean and a faculty employee on a terminal contract in one

see blue.

of the tenure-ineligible title series, a faculty performance review may be conducted.

All educational unit administrators who have faculty on Phased Retirement shall take steps to ensure that those individuals are meeting or exceeding their unit's performance expectations in their areas of assignment.

Faculty employees on out-of-state assignments in international or other programs shall be evaluated for purposes of performance review based on their performances and accomplishments in their assigned areas of activity in accordance with [AR 3:4](#).

How are faculty who have joint appointments evaluated?

For a faculty employee with a joint appointment, where the secondary assignment comprises no more than twenty percent (20%) of the individual's total DOE effort, the unit administrator of the department, school, graduate center or college in which the faculty employee has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty employee, with input from the unit administrator of the secondary unit. If a faculty employee's secondary assignment comprises more than twenty percent (20%) of the individual's total DOE effort, the unit administrator of the unit in which each assignment is performed will evaluate the faculty employee's performance.

How are faculty associated with multidisciplinary research centers and institutes evaluated?

Faculty employees whose assigned DOE effort in a multidisciplinary research center or institute is greater than twenty percent (20%) shall have the activity performed in the center or institute evaluated by the educational unit administrator of that unit. The unit administrator of the center or institute shall report the merit score(s) to the unit administrator of the individual's primary unit. In cases where a faculty employee performs assigned DOE duties in a multidisciplinary research center or institute totaling twenty percent (20%) or less DOE effort, the individual's primary unit administrator will evaluate the activity performed in the center or institute with input from the educational unit administrator of the secondary unit.

What policies and procedures inform the faculty review process?

Deans and educational unit administrators can help ensure the integrity of the performance review process by clearly communicating to faculty the specific University and college policies that inform the faculty performance review process. What follows is an overview of the salient University policies on faculty performance review.

Faculty performance shall be evaluated across all areas of assigned activity as recorded in the Distribution of Effort (DOE) agreements applicable to the review period. Faculty activity is broadly defined and includes: [1] instruction (i.e., teaching and advising); [2] research and/or other appropriate forms of creative activity; [3] service (includes service to the public, service to the profession, service to the institution, patient care unrelated to instruction, and other appropriate outreach activities); [4] administration; and [5] professional development.

Each faculty employee under review is responsible for preparing a summary of professional accomplishments in each area of assigned activity; where teaching has been assigned, the faculty employee will also prepare a teaching portfolio. Results of the evaluation will be communicated

seeblue.

in writing to the faculty employee by the chair or director, and to the dean.

Reviews are to be based on the composite distribution of effort (DOE) across the review period performed by the faculty employee in each area of assigned activity. Quantitative and qualitative information will be used and explained in making judgments about performance.

The evaluation instrument or forms that are used in each college are to be developed by the dean of the college and must involve consultation with an appropriate faculty governance body.

Letter, numerical, or descriptive designations may be used in the evaluation instrument, but the rankings must clearly recognize at least three performance designations: outstanding, good or satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. Evaluators are expected to be both fair and constructive.

Evaluations must contain sufficient written commentary to explain the assigned ratings, especially in areas of activity in which a faculty employee has received a rating below “Satisfactory Performance.”

It is also expected that the educational unit administrator will consider inputs from students, colleagues and administrators in arriving at merit ratings, consistent with [AR 3:10](#).

The educational unit administrator will review each faculty employee and recommend a merit rating consistent with the rating scale adopted by the college for each area of assigned activity. A composite merit score shall be calculated by the educational unit administrator and recorded on the merit report for each faculty person reviewed in the unit. An individual’s composite merit score is calculated by multiplying the merit rating assigned to an area of activity by the DOE percentage apportioned for that area of activity. The product of a merit rating for an area of activity multiplied by its DOE percentage is the *merit score* for that area. The *composite merit score* is the sum of those discrete merits scores. A dean may implement a college-wide practice of rounding all composite merit scores to the nearest whole number.

The Appeal Process

All faculty employees must be provided the opportunity to lodge a formal appeal with the college dean. The appeal may be based on a claim of procedural error and/or contested merit score(s) in the faculty employee’s performance review. Procedures for college-level faculty appeals should be developed and clearly communicated to all faculty employees within the college. If a faculty employee appeals at the college level and is dissatisfied with the decision of the dean, an appeal may be made to the Provost. A faculty appeals committee will be appointed after seeking advice about the committee composition from the Senate Council. This appeal committee will make its recommendation to the Provost, whose decision will be final. The procedural steps for Provost-level appeals have been posted on the Office for Faculty Advancement website: (<http://www.uky.edu/ofa/node/9>).

2nd and 4th Year Progress Reviews of Probationary Faculty

Please be reminded that one element of the policy on faculty performance review (*AR 3:10.B.4*) requires mandatory progress reviews of untenured (tenure-eligible) faculty employees in their second and fourth years of probationary service. The policy requires that the educational unit administrator:

- Consult with the tenured faculty of the review candidate's unit about the individual's progress toward consideration for tenure in terms of the unit's expectations;
- Prepare a written review of the candidate's progress; and,
- Discuss the written review with the individual under review.

The discussions and the written progress review that documents those discussions, along with the reappointment process that runs in tandem with those progress reviews, shall be concluded *no later than* the last day of the individual's appointment contract in the second and fourth years of probationary service. Progress reviews may occur more frequently. The written review shall be sent to the dean of the college and a copy shall be given to the individual under review and placed in the individual's Standard Personnel File.

2017-2018 Calendar for Reviews

The schedule for the review and evaluation process is as follows:

Fall 2017	Faculty employees undergoing review prepare their materials and submit them to the appropriate educational unit administrator(s).
February 12, 2018	Review completed by college and faculty employees informed of results.
March 2, 2018	Deadline for a faculty employee to appeal at the college level.
March 23, 2018	Appeals at the college level completed.
April 13, 2018	Deadline for a faculty employee to appeal to the Provost.

Finally, if there are any aspects of the review process on which you wish additional guidance, please feel free to contact the Office for Faculty Advancement.

TST/gtl/ab