



Office of the Dean
College of Agriculture, Food and Environment
S-123 Agricultural Science Bldg. North
Lexington, KY 40546-0091
(859) 257-4772
Fax: (859) 323-2885
www.uky.edu

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 30, 2016

TO: Chairs and Directors

FROM: Nancy Cox, Dean *Nancy M. Cox*

SUBJECT: 2016 Annual Performance Review of Faculty (APR)
for Calendar Years 2015 and 2016

Performance review of faculty will be conducted in accordance with AR 3:10 and [Provost Tracy's memo to Deans, Chairs and Directors](#). The CAFE Online Faculty Evaluation System will be open to faculty September 21-October 19.

This is the first year of the biennium; therefore, all continuing and newly-hired faculty members regardless of title series and including lecturers and senior lecturers will be evaluated except (1) tenured faculty who will retire before or at the end of the current fiscal year (faculty members in this category are not included in any potential new fiscal year raise pools), (2) non-tenured faculty whose appointments will not extend beyond the end of the current fiscal year. Please note, new faculty hired during 2016 will not be given a score of NR, but will be evaluated along with other faculty. The wording under [our "3" rating](#) will likely cover most of these faculty except in the most unusual of cases.

New for 2016: Faculty members on phased retirement appointments will be evaluated through the On-line Faculty Evaluation System along with the rest of the faculty members under review.

Department chairs shall utilize the advice of tenured faculty members and others in assessing the quality and quantity of faculty members' performance during the two preceding calendar years (2015 and 2016) in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, extension education, university and public service, and/or other appropriate activities with relative weightings based upon prior agreements pertinent to distribution of effort among any or all of these activities. The faculty input may be through an advisory committee, through consultation with all tenured faculty members, or through other appropriate means of faculty consultation. The chair recommends merit ratings for each area of activity to the dean. Final ratings, merit scores, and composite merit scores are determined after the conference with the chair and the dean. If the dean and the chair are unable to agree upon an individual's

ratings and scores, the faculty member will be informed of the ratings and scores of both the chair and the dean and informed that the ratings and scores of the dean are final. After final scores are determined, there will be a conference between the chair and each faculty member, focusing upon the faculty member's performance of his/her assignment during the period of review, strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement if appropriate.

If a faculty member disagrees with ratings and scores, he/she may request a conference with the dean, associate deans, and department chair. In such case, the faculty member will be invited to present additional information relating to performance at the conference. A faculty member who, after a conference with the deans and chair, still disagrees with ratings and scores received may formally appeal to the dean. The appeal will be heard by a Faculty Appeals Committee appointed by the dean from a list of nominees forwarded to the dean by the Agriculture Faculty Council. After the hearing, the committee will make a recommendation to the dean and the dean will accept or reject the recommendation and advise the faculty member of this decision. A faculty member remaining in disagreement with the decision may appeal to the Provost for a hearing in accordance with established procedures.

We will use the same [five-point rating scale](#) used last year. The department chair will assign a rating for each area of DOE; this merit rating may be fractional (e.g., 1.5, 2.5, 3.5 or 4.5) if the department chooses, and should be multiplied by DOE to reach the merit score in each area of activity (note the Chair Rating scores are not formulaic). The Dean Rating scores are formulaic and will be the sum of the discrete merit ratings x DOE for each area of activity. The Final Rating will not be numeric this year, but rather expressed as Exceptional Accomplishments, Meets High Expectations, Satisfactory Performance, Below Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

No pre-determined frequency distributions will be forced on Final Ratings "Unsatisfactory" through "Meets High Expectations." The Exceptional Accomplishments (5) Final Rating will be unlikely to constitute more than 10-15% of the faculty for the biennium.

APRs will be conducted in the On-line Faculty Evaluation System with only the final, signed one-page form printed for the Standard Personnel File (SPF). Chairs may choose to print other materials as needed. Other features:

1. Faculty may complete an optional self-evaluation on-line form.
2. Faculty members will submit their CV (for calendar years 2015 and 2016 only), and teaching portfolio (for calendar years 2015 and 2016 only) by uploading these documents into the system as PDFs.
3. If faculty members had administrative and/or professional development assignments during the review period (calendar years 2015 and 2016) an explanation must be noted in the box provided for that purpose in the On-line Faculty Evaluation System. If the assignment is explained within the faculty member's CV, they may simply note, "see CV, page x, item x."
4. At the opening of the teaching portfolio state faculty member's name. Also, it is strongly recommended that faculty list the following information (for calendar years 2015 and 2016 only) in a concise format:
 - a. Course prefix, number, section, short title, term/year taught, enrollment, teacher/course evaluation scores (if applicable).

- b. Student advising, activities, other (e.g., number of advisees, club advising, committees);
- c. Teaching innovation and improvement (e.g., new courses developed, pedagogical innovations, teaching improvement activities or programs);
- d. Teaching scholarship and recognition (e.g., awards, teaching publications).

The suggested limit for teaching portfolios is 14 pages or less. See more information on [teaching portfolios](#).

5. DOE is being loaded into the On-line Faculty Evaluation System from the Faculty Effort System (FES), which is based on fiscal years. Therefore, for this two-year review, DOE is calculated by using weighted averages as follows:

January 1, 2015-June 30, 2015 (FY '15) x .5

July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016 (FY '16) x 1

July 1, 2016-December 31, 2016 (FY '17) x .5

Faculty members should work with their chairs if they want to recalculate DOE data in the On-line Faculty Evaluation System.

6. The signature line on the final form includes a statement about DOE.
7. Per page 3 of the [Provost's memorandum](#), "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 merit scores. A dean may implement a college-wide practice of rounding all composite merit scores to the nearest integer." The 2016 On-line Faculty Evaluation System accommodates the formulaic calculation of merit scores for scores entered by the deans, and the deans reserve the right to round composite merit scores to a whole number. Note also that the [Annual Performance Review Rating Categories'](#) definition for "Exceptional Accomplishments" (5) requires a rating of "Meeting High Expectations" (4) in all assigned DOE categories.