

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans

From: Kumble Subbaswamy 
Provost

Heidi M. Anderson 
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

Re: 2010-2011 Faculty Performance Review: First Year of Biennium

Date: September 14, 2010

The evaluation of faculty performance is one of the most important functions of department chairs, division directors and other evaluators. The purpose of the Faculty Performance Review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development. When done properly, the evaluation process is an effective means of improving performance, motivating faculty members to reach higher levels of achievement, communicating expectations and dealing with performance-related issues. In addition, faculty performance reviews are an important source of information for the promotion and tenure review process.

Administrative Regulation 3:10 (“Policies for Faculty Performance Review” formerly AR II-1.0-5) enumerates the policies and procedures for conducting performance evaluation of faculty at the University of Kentucky. This AR is attached and is also available online at www.uky.edu/Regulations/AR.htm. This memo provides a brief summary of those policies and procedures.

General Information

- All probationary (tenure-track) faculty will be evaluated annually.
- All newly hired faculty in any title series will be evaluated in their first year of service.
- All faculty in the Lecturer Series will be evaluated annually.
- All tenure-ineligible faculty who are continuing will be evaluated annually (e.g., Clinical Title Series, Research Title Series).
- Any tenured faculty member may request an “off-year” performance review.
- Faculty performance shall be evaluated across all areas of assigned activity as recorded in the Distribution of Effort (DOE) applicable to the review period.
- 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 member also will prepare a teaching portfolio.
- Results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member by the department chair or school director, and to the dean.

Joint Appointments

For a faculty member with a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty member’s effort, the chair of the department/division in which the faculty member has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty member, with input from the chair of the department/division in which the individual has a secondary appointment. If the secondary appointment comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty member’s effort, the faculty member will be evaluated by both the department/division chairs in the primary department and the secondary department.

Schedule of Title Series for Review

This is the first year of the biennium. The following table provides a summary of faculty to be reviewed:

Table of Performance Evaluation During **First Year** of Biennium

	Regular Title Series	Special Title Series	Extension Title Series	Librarian Title Series	Research Title Series	Clinical Title Series	Lecturer or Senior Lecturer Ranks
Tenured	YES	YES	YES	YES	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tenure-track	YES	YES	YES	YES	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tenure-ineligible but continuing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES	YES	YES
On terminal contract	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*	NO*	NO*
Retiring this fiscal year	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

* unless agreed to by mutual consent of the faculty and dean

Exceptions in this Biennium:

- Faculty who do not need to be evaluated include:
 - Tenured faculty who have formally indicated their intention to retire on or before the end of the current fiscal year;
 - Non-tenured faculty whose appointments will not be renewed (i.e., faculty on a terminal contract whose appointment will not extend beyond the end of the current fiscal year).

Faculty members exempt from a required review by these circumstances may, after consultation with their department chair/director, elect by mutual agreement to be reviewed on a voluntary basis. As indicated in the table above, faculty in title series ineligible for tenure but whose positions are likely to continue should be reviewed since future promotion and salary increments are linked to their evaluation. Faculty on out-of-state assignments in international or other programs shall be evaluated for purposes of performance review and promotion based on their performances and accomplishments in their assigned areas of activity in accordance with AR 3:4.

Process and Procedures

Before beginning the evaluative process, the college dean or director shall communicate the procedures used in the performance review to all faculty employees. Please be certain that the procedures employed in the performance review of faculty comply fully with AR 3:10 policies about the areas of performance, sources of evaluative material, distribution of effort, consultation with faculty, rating systems, and appeals. Please share a copy of this memorandum and attached

regulation with your faculty, or provide the web locations for these regulations and this memorandum.

The performance review for each faculty member documents his or her effectiveness and progress in the following activities during the calendar year (for those not reviewed last year, the past two years): [1] instruction (i.e., teaching and advising); [2] research and/or other appropriate forms of creative scholarship; [3] university service, public service, outreach services, professional leadership, and/or other appropriate activities; [4] and patient care and related clinical activity. Reviews are to be based on the distribution of effort (DOE) performed by the faculty member. Thus, relative weightings and attention given to each activity in making judgments are to be based on the prior agreement of DOE across these activities. 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 group. Letter, numerical, or descriptive designations may be used in the evaluation instrument, but the rankings must clearly recognize at least three designations: outstanding, good or satisfactory, and unsatisfactory performance. Evaluators are expected to be both fair and constructive. Evaluations must contain sufficient written commentary to explain the assigned ratings, especially if there is an unsatisfactory rating or if the need for significant improvement is cited.

The department chair/director will review each faculty employee and recommend an evaluation rating to the dean of the college. Also, it is expected that chairs and directors consult with a suitable committee of peers within the unit in arriving at merit ratings.

Performance Review - Appeal Process

All faculty employees must be provided opportunities for an appeal at the college level as needed. Procedures for faculty appeals should be developed and clearly communicated to all faculty within the college. If a faculty employee appeals at the college level and still disagrees with the decision of the dean, an appeal may be made to the Provost. An 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.

Tenure Progress Review in 2nd and 4th Years

Please be reminded that one element of policies on faculty performance review (*AR 3:10.B.4*) requires mandatory tenure progress reviews in which the “unit administrator shall consult with the tenured members of the faculty” and prepare a written progress review that the unit administrator shall discuss with the individual under review. These discussions and the written review that documents those discussions should occur at the end of the non-tenured faculty member’s second and fourth years, but 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.

Calendar for Reviews

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

February 11, 2011	Review completed by college and faculty employees informed of results.
March 11, 2011	Deadline for a faculty employee to appeal at the college level.
April 4, 2011	Appeals at the college level completed.
April 25, 2011	Deadline for a faculty employees to appeal to the Provost.
May 9, 2011	Appeals to Provost completed.

Finally, if there are any aspects of the review process on which you wish additional guidance, please feel free to contact us. Please note, this memorandum is also posted online at http://www.uky.edu/Provost/APFA/Promotion_Tenure/Faculty_Performance_Review.pdf

We welcome the opportunity to work with you in the faculty performance review process. Our investments in this activity help to move programs forward, and they support individual faculty development.

Thank you for your attention to the selection, progression and evaluation of our greatest asset – the faculty.

attachment

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS	IDENTIFICATION AR 3:10 <i>(Formerly, AR II-1.0-5)</i>	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE 12/16/00	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED 8/30/88 6/11/92 1/18/96 8/18/98 10/8/99

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 or president of the college, during the first year of each biennium with the rating applying for the biennium. Any tenured faculty member, 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.

In the University System, the Department/Division Chair will review each faculty member and recommend an evaluation rating to the dean/community college president of the college to which the department/division is assigned. The performance of each faculty member appointed in the extension title series will be reviewed by the chairperson of the department 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 member with a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty member's effort, the chair of the department/division in which the faculty member has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty member, with input from the chair of the department/division in which the individual has a secondary appointment. If the secondary appointment comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty member's effort, the faculty member will be evaluated by the department/division chairs in the primary department and the secondary department.

In a Graduate Center, the Center Director will review each faculty member assigned to the center and recommend an evaluation rating to the Dean of the Graduate School. A faculty member who has a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment in a center or institute comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty member's effort, will be reviewed by the chair of the department 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 member's effort, then the individual will be evaluated in both the primary department 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 (refer to Section A of AR II-1.1-8).

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 member both a quantitative assessment and a qualitative judgment of the faculty member'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 member.

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 member. 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 member's teaching and advising should be documented by a body of supporting materials regularly maintained and updated by the faculty member. For the University System, 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 member shall document the contribution he/she has made to the collective project. The appraisal of the faculty member's effectiveness as part of the collaborative or multidisciplinary effort should include evaluation statements by the other members of the team.

4. The quantitative data are to be provided at least once annually by the faculty member to the department or division chairperson through an instrument approved by the appropriate chancellor or vice president.

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 member.

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 administrator of each educational unit (e.g., department, division, school, community college, or college organized as whole) with advice from the faculty of the unit will develop an overall distribution of faculty time for approval by the dean or president of the college or next administrative officer. In any case of disagreement that is not readily resolved, the decision of the dean or president of the college or next administrative officer will be final.

3. A written agreement is to be developed annually between the unit administrator and the faculty member on the distribution of effort expected of the faculty member in major activities during the succeeding year. For any faculty member 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 member, director of the research center or institute, the department chairperson, 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 member'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 member shall be assigned duties by the unit commensurate with making due progress toward meeting requirements for tenure. The annual performance review of each non-tenured faculty member shall include some discussion with the unit administrator of the individual's progress toward consideration for tenure in terms of the unit's expectations.

4. The unit administrator shall consult with the tenured members of the faculty regarding the progress of each non-tenured faculty member toward consideration for tenure in terms of the unit's expectations. Consultation about a non-tenured faculty member 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 II-1.1-8). For each non-tenured faculty member who is associated with any multidisciplinary research centers or institutes, the 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 member's second and fourth years, but may occur more frequently at the administrator's discretion. The results of these discussions should be communicated to the individual non-tenured faculty member and a record maintained in the faculty member's 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 academic 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 academic sector (Medical Center, Lexington Campus, Community College System, Research and Graduate Studies, or Information Systems) levels.

1. On the sector level, under certain conditions and after being considered in the college, appeals can be addressed to the appropriate chancellor or vice president.

2. An appeal emanating from a college shall be considered by a committee appointed by the chancellor or vice president; after a hearing, the committee will make a recommendation to the chancellor or vice president whose decision shall be final.

E. The responsibility for developing the procedures by which the policies for faculty performance review are to be implemented in each academic sector of the University is centered in the office of the chancellor or vice president for that academic sector.

1. The colleges are the focal points to which the review procedures are delegated.

2. The dean or president of each college is responsible for the exercise of the procedures.

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.