



Office of the Provost
105 Main Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0032

859 257-2911
fax 859 257-1333

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans, Chairs and Directors

From: Timothy S. Tracy 
Interim Provost

Re: 2012-13 Faculty Performance Review: First Year of Biennium

Date: September 10, 2012

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. When done properly, the evaluation process is an effective means of communicating expectations, motivating faculty to reach higher levels of achievement and having those accomplishments acknowledged and rewarded, and identifying 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](#)”) 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.

Which faculty cohort is being reviewed this year?

This being the first year of the current biennium, all full-time faculty employees across all title series shall undergo faculty performance evaluation, including all new full-time faculty (all title series and academic ranks) who are in their first year of service.

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. Faculty 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 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 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) 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 scholarship; [3] university service, public service, outreach services, professional leadership, and/or other appropriate activities; [4] and patient care and related clinical activity.

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

Reviews are to be based on the distribution of effort (DOE) performed by the faculty. 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 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 if there is an unsatisfactory rating or if the need for significant improvement is cited.

It is also expected that the unit administrator will consult with a suitable committee of peers within the unit in arriving at merit ratings.

The 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 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 their faculty 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 to the Faculty Advancement [website](#).

2nd and 4th Year Progress Reviews of Probationary Faculty

Please be reminded that one element of the policies 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 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.

Calendar for Reviews

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

Fall 2012	Faculty employees prepare their materials to submit to appropriate educational unit administrator
February 8, 2013	Review completed by college and faculty employees informed of results.
March 8, 2013	Deadline for a faculty employee to appeal at the college level.
April 5, 2013	Appeals at the college level completed.
April 26, 2013	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](#).

kh