

1 **507 Annual Evaluations for Faculty**

2 **Purpose: To define responsibilities in annual evaluation procedures**

3 **Source: OVSP Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University**

4 **Applicability: Faculty**

5
6 **Policy**

7 Each unit must have written policies describing the process, criteria, and appeals used in annual
8 performance reviews. These written plans must explain how annual performance reviews are
9 used in salary adjustments and in initiating performance improvement plans required under post-
10 tenure review. The unit's written plans must be approved by the voting members of the unit's
11 academic assembly as specified by the unit policies, the Dean, and the Campus Provost. College
12 plans must be approved by the voting members of the college's academic assembly as specified
13 by College policy; and by the Provost. Unit plans should incorporate definitions and evidence as
14 described in ACD 506-01.

15
16 The collection of supportive materials pertinent to all such decisions will be the responsibility of
17 the faculty member, except that the department personnel committees and the chairs will collect
18 supplementary confidential evaluation letters where required.

19
20 **Purposes of Annual Performance Reviews**

21 Annual performance reviews serve three distinct purposes: (1) To comply with ABOR
22 requirements for an annual review of all faculty with the purpose of encouraging the faculty
23 member to establish goals for continued academic progress, (2) To guide decisions about salary
24 allocation, and (3) For tenured faculty, as the first step in the post-tenure review process.
25 Because the annual performance review must serve three distinct but related purposes, the unit's
26 written plan must incorporate ABOR requirements for an annual assessment as well as the
27 requirements specified in policies governing salary adjustments and post-tenure review.

28
29 **Relationship to Probationary Reviews, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews**

30 Annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure, promotion, termination, or release decisions.
31 For probationary faculty, the annual evaluation should not be confused with the probationary
32 review. Annual feedback on progress toward tenure for probationary faculty may occur at the
33 same time and be based upon the same material as the annual performance review, but
34 probationary reviews are prospective and reflect the academic unit's estimate of the candidate's
35 future promise. Thus, the procedures and standards used in annual performance reviews are
36 different from those used in retention, promotion, and tenure reviews. Annual performance
37 reviews are retrospective and summative, whereas tenure and promotion reviews are prospective
38 and summative.

39
40 Typically, units have different levels of performance expected for annual performance reviews
41 (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, merit, and so forth), than for retention, tenure and promotion,
42 which require "excellence." Procedures differ in that the final decision about the performance
43 level in an annual review is made by the chair or a personnel committee (with exceptions for

1 appeals, as noted below); whereas the final decision in a probationary, tenure, or promotion
2 review is made by the Provost based on independent assessments from the unit personnel
3 committee, chair or director, college personnel committee, dean, and (in the case of tenure and
4 promotion), the campus personnel committee.

5
6 Even though annual performance reviews differ significantly from probationary, tenure, and
7 promotion reviews, there are some common elements. Annual performance reviews should be as
8 similar as possible to the other reviews in terms of the categories of faculty work that are
9 evaluated (e.g., teaching/instruction, research/creative activities, service); the definitions and scope
10 of each of these kinds of faculty work; and the types of evidence that faculty are expected to
11 provide for the review.

12 13 **Procedures for Annual Performance Evaluations**

14
15 1. The chairs and directors of academic units are responsible for conducting annual performance
16 evaluations for all tenured and probationary faculty. Unit Heads, Supervising Deans, and the
17 Campus Provosts are responsible for insuring the fair and consistent application of policy during
18 annual performance reviews. ABOR policy requires that the unit's personnel committee or
19 other peer evaluators must be involved, but it is the chair's or director's responsibility to see that
20 these evaluations are completed by April 30 for all tenured and probationary faculty

21
22 2. Faculty members are to be informed of the essential content of the evaluations. To that end,
23 procedures should:

24 a. provide that each faculty member will be notified that he or she is expected to furnish
25 to the unit head or peer committee, prior to the evaluation, information about the faculty
26 member's performance and activities during the evaluation period.

27 b. provide that each faculty member will receive, annually, from his or her unit head, a
28 letter commenting on his or her performance, including areas of strength, weakness,
29 needed improvement, opportunities for growth, and expectations for future distribution
30 of effort and performance

31 c. provide that the letter will include—in the case of faculty who have not yet been
32 tenured and/or promoted to full rank—a statement which indicates that the procedures for
33 the annual evaluation are not the same as the procedures for a tenure or promotion review

34
35 3. In years when merit money is available, such evaluations must guide the allocation of merit
36 adjustments as provided in the unit's written plan. . However, the evaluations should be
37 conducted whether or not merit money will be available.

38
39 4. For the annual performance review to serve the three distinct purposes noted above, it must
40 be consistent with ABOR policy that guides annual performance review, as well as ABOR and
41 ASU policies governing salary adjustments and post-tenure review. To this end, the annual
42 performance review:

43 a. Should cover the previous 36 months;

- b. Must assess the faculty member's contributions in terms of teaching/instruction; research and creative activities; service; and contributions to the unit's affirmative action and diversity goals (contributions to affirmative action and diversity goals may be incorporated into each of the other categories or may be consolidated into the service category);
- c. Must provide four distinct measurements that distinguish between "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" performance in each of the following areas: teaching/instruction, research and creative activities, service, and an overall assessment;
- d. Must differentiate among various levels of "satisfactory" performance to guide decisions about merit-based salary adjustments, (such as "merit," "exemplary" "high merit, and so on);
- e. Must be based upon written expectations agreed to between the faculty member and unit head;
- f. Must assess the past performance as well as establish expectations of the future distribution of effort and achievements
- g. Should take into account the distribution of effort across the various types of faculty responsibilities including negotiated flexible agreements;

5. The criteria and methods of determining the level of performance are guided by the written plan of the unit but must be consistent with college, ASU, and ABOR policies. With regard to teaching, ABOR policy mandates "a systematic assessment of student opinion be present [must be one] but not be the only component of the evaluation]. Additionally, ABOR requires consideration of "student advising and mentoring whether classified as teaching or service. Criteria for research/ creative activities and service are specified at the unit level.

6. Distribution of effort for the unit as a whole normally will provide equal weights to teaching/instruction and to research/creative activities. The distribution for individual faculty, however, may differ from the unit standard provided that a flexible performance agreement has been negotiated between the faculty member and the unit head, in accord with unit policies governing such agreements. Normally, flexible performance arrangements will be available only to tenured faculty. The implications of such agreements for promotion to full professor must be considered.

7. Faculty who participate as affiliated or "core" faculty in another unit (department, center, institute, or program), may document their contributions to these programs and (if documented) these contributions should be taken into account in the annual performance evaluation.

8. Faculty may request a review of his or her performance evaluation to the next-higher administrative level above the person who made the initial performance recommendation. For example, if a program director who is responsible to a department chair made the initial recommendation, the individual could request a review from the department chair, whereas if the department chair made the initial evaluation, the individual could request a review from the dean. The request for such a review must be made within 30 days after the individual receives his or her

1 written evaluation. The final decision lies with the reviewer, who must complete the review
2 within 30 days after it is requested (30 days is measured in 30 work days, summer excluded).
3 There are no procedures for hearings unless a grievance is alleged.

4 9. Appeals of salary decisions may also be made. Grounds for an appeal of salary decisions
5 shall be failure to implement the unit’s approved evaluation and salary plan consistently.
6 Appeals shall be filed first at the unit level and, if necessary, then at the next administrative level.
7 For colleges with departments, the unit appeal process shall be approved by a vote of the unit’s
8 faculty and academic professionals, and the college appeal process shall be approved by a vote of
9 the college’s faculty and academic professionals. For colleges without departments, the college
10 appeal process shall be approved by a vote of the college’s faculty / academic professionals, and
11 the appeal process at the next administrative level shall be determined by the provost in
12 consultation with the college faculty and academic professionals.

13
14 10. An individual may grieve deviation from the Board of Regents or university’s policies and
15 procedures to the appropriate grievance committee. Grievances based on discrimination are to be
16 referred to the Office of Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action (EO/AA).

17
18 **CROSS REFERENCES:**

19 ACD 506-05, “Promotion” and ACD 506-06, “Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion”
20