Rochester Institute of Technology is committed to promoting academic excellence. As stated in our mission, teaching, scholarship, and service are our central enterprises, and effective teaching continues to be the hallmark of RIT. This policy assumes the dignity and academic freedom of individual faculty members and its implementation shall be guided by mutual trust.

This policy establishes guidelines for the evaluation of the performance of each full-time faculty member against established university criteria and in accordance with the mission and goals of each faculty member’s department and college. The results of the review will be used to:

- encourage and foster continued professional development;
- provide part of the required documentation as specified in other policies;
- promote the improvement of individual performance; and,
- inform annual merit increments.

An underlying principle of this policy is that faculty review and development are closely related and work in concert to help faculty meet individual and institutional goals.

II. Faculty Review Process

A. The immediate supervisor of each full-time faculty member shall ensure that an annual written evaluation is placed in the employee’s record. Those who are eligible for contract renewal must participate in the annual performance review process as described below.

A.B. The areas on which performance is rated include teaching, scholarship, and service. The expectations for each faculty member shall be consistent with the performance criteria in the university and college policies for tenure (E5.0) and promotion (E6.0). The weighting of these performance criteria may vary among academic units, and faculty members. The expectations within these areas will differ among faculty classifications (E1.0) and ranks (E6.0), and may vary among colleges and among academic units. The expectations for a faculty member shall be reflected in the faculty member’s plan of work; and the plan of work is an important element of the annual evaluation (see section F. below).
The criteria for the review shall be consistent with the performance criteria in the university policies for tenure (E5.0) and promotion (E6.0). The application of specific criteria and their weighting may vary among academic units, and among faculty members.

B.C. The performance categories for evaluating all faculty members with respect to their annual plans of work shall be: Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory. A faculty member receives a performance evaluation for each area as appropriate and according to one’s plan of work, and an overall evaluation.

In a given area, a rating of:

**Outstanding** reflects performance that represents a truly exceptional level of accomplishment.

**Exceeds Expectations** reflects performance that exceeds the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member.

**Meets Expectations** reflects the performance that meets the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member.

**Needs Improvement** reflects performance that does not meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member. This rating indicates a deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.

**Unsatisfactory** reflects performance that repeatedly fails to meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member in a way that (1) reflects disregard of previous reviews or other efforts to provide correction or assistance or (2) involves professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

D. Guidance on the use of these performance categories for the overall rating is provided for clarity to the faculty member and guidance for the administrator and is provided below.

**Outstanding** – For an overall performance rating of **Outstanding**, the faculty member must be rated at least **Exceeds Expectations** in each area.

**Exceeds Expectations** - For an overall performance rating of **Exceeds Expectations**, a faculty member must be rated at least **Exceeds Expectations** in one area and at least **Meets Expectations** in the other areas.
Meets Expectations – For an overall performance rating of Meets Expectations, a faculty member cannot have any ratings of Unsatisfactory.

Needs Improvement – An overall performance rating of Needs Improvement indicates a deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.

Unsatisfactory – An overall performance rating of Unsatisfactory represents performance that repeatedly fails to meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member in a way that (1) reflects disregard of previous reviews or other efforts to provide correction or assistance or (2) involves professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. Obtaining an Unsatisfactory rating in any one category should lead to an Unsatisfactory -rating overall.

Faculty receiving a rating of Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory should work with his/her department head to actively seek assistance to improve his or her job performance (e.g. III.A.).

| Description | Performance represents a truly exceptional level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty rank within their college, academic unit, and norms within their field(s). For an overall rating of Outstanding, the faculty member must be rated (1) Outstanding in one area, and Exceeds Expectations in the other areas, or (2) Exceeds Expectations in all three areas. |
| Performance exceeds the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty rank within their college, academic unit, and norms within their field(s). For an overall rating of Exceeds Expectations, a faculty member cannot have any ratings below Meets Expectations. |
| Performance meets the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty rank within their college, academic unit, and norms within their field(s). For an overall rating of Meets Expectations, a faculty member cannot have any ratings of Unsatisfactory. |
| Performance does not meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty rank within their college, academic unit, and norms within their field(s). This rating indicates a deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to corrective actions. |
| Performance repeatedly fails to meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty rank within their college, academic unit, and norms. |

within their field(s) in a way that (1) reflects disregard of previous reviews or other efforts to provide correction or assistance or (2) involves professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. Obtaining an Unsatisfactory rating in any one category will, by definition, lead to an Unsatisfactory rating overall.

E. The time frame for the period of review shall be January 1 through December 31. Each college shall provide a published timeline to ensure that the overall process is completed by April 15 or the next business day.

F. Each college's review process must include the following elements:

1. Plan of Work

   a. To support the annual evaluation, each faculty member shall submit a copy of his or her plan of work for the current and previous academic years. The plan of work is a document that faculty prepare in the spring of each academic year outlining the faculty member's expected work activities, anticipated outcomes, and specific performance expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for the following academic year's contract period. The plan of work should explicitly address any items of concern that emerge from the annual review process. The plan of work may also describe how work activities will fit with the faculty member's longer term performance or promotion aspirations.

   b. Each college or department may have its own published guidelines for developing a plan of work. At a minimum, the plan of work must be approved and signed by the faculty member, department head, and dean. The plan of work shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty member's department (or departments in the case of joint appointments).

   c. An approved plan of work shall be finalized after the annual review is complete, but no later than the beginning of the faculty member's contract period for the upcoming academic year. For faculty in their first year at RIT, their initial contract letters shall serve as their plans of work, unless superseded by an agreed upon plan of work.

2. The faculty member's written self-evaluation and evidence of performance against the criteria specified above (II.B) and the elements of the plan of work that overlap with the review period. Evidence of performance should include at a minimum the following:

   a. Results from the core and college questions on the university-wide student rating of instruction survey for all sections assigned in the plan of work will be accessible through the RIT Student Rating System at a disaggregated level. If
course sections are assigned to a faculty member for an academic term for which
the RIT Student Rating System is not available as a tool to conduct a student
rating of instruction survey, the college shall implement an equivalent instruction
survey for students to complete and the results of which will be maintained in the
faculty member’s file in the Dean’s Office. Student ratings shall not be the sole
source of data used to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Response rates should be
taken into consideration when reviewing student ratings. Other possible teaching
effectiveness data may include alumni ratings; peer ratings; self-assessment
statements; syllabi and other course documents; examples of student work; and
teaching portfolios.

b. Evidence of scholarly achievement and quality as defined by the faculty
member’s college and department for the review period.

c. Written confirmation of participation on college and university committees and
self-assessment of performance on those committees and professional service
activities.

3. An annual written evaluation from the department head based on the time period of
January 1-December 31. The evaluation will entail assignment of one of the five
performance categories to the faculty member’s performance in each of the
following areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. The evaluation will also assign
one of the five performance categories to the overall faculty member’s performance.
Faculty shall be evaluated on the basis of objective criteria as applied to their own
performance, expectations within their college, and norms within their field and not on the basis of their relative performance vis-a-vis the performance of
others in their academic unit. This evaluation should include an indication of
progress towards promotion and/or tenure when appropriate.

F. A joint meeting between the faculty member and the department head to discuss the
results of the annual review and the proposed plan of work for the next academic year
contract period. Based on this meeting, the plan of work shall be developed in accordance
with II.E above. In addition, the department head may choose to amend the annual
review. The faculty member has the opportunity to include a response to the annual
review that becomes part of the official documentation.

G. The final annual review including amendments, when applicable, and proposed plan of
work shall be signed by the department head and faculty member. The original
documents shall be retained on file in the Office of the Dean and in accordance with
C22.0 - Records Management Policy. A copy of the final documents shall be provided to
the faculty member immediately upon completion of the process.

H. Faculty members who believe this policy has been unfairly or improperly implemented
are referred to the policies on Faculty Grievance (E24.0), Appeal Committee on Faculty
Salaries (E14.0), and Discrimination and Harassment (C6.0).
III. Faculty Development Process

A. Tenure-track faculty who are rated as Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory in either teaching or scholarship must work with their department head to develop and implement an appropriate plan of improvement. To facilitate improvement, faculty may be eligible for a Faculty Improvement Fund (FIF) grant to support the plan. These funds will be distributed by the dean.

B. Each faculty member whose approved plan of work identifies areas of development which address the university’s educational goals or department, college or university strategic plans shall be eligible to apply for professional development assistance from the university. Examples of assistance include but are not limited to collegial mentoring, opportunities to take courses, release time, financial assistance, tutoring, or supplies. Requests for such development assistance should follow the process outlined below in C.

C. Tenure-track faculty, senior lecturers, principal lecturers, and lecturers with multiple year contracts, are eligible for funds from the Faculty Education and Development (FEAD) fund. These funds shall be appropriated by the university to each college in proportion to the number of tenure-track faculty, senior and principal lecturers, and lecturers with multiple year contracts. Disbursement of these funds shall proceed as follows:

1. Each college shall establish a FEAD Committee to consist of no fewer than three members, elected from and by the tenure-track faculty of the college. If a college has another committee whose membership complies with these specifications, the faculty of the college may designate it as the FEAD Committee.

2. The FEAD Committee shall initiate a request for proposals from eligible faculty members. Proposals will be due by a date to be established in each college.

3. Proposals for FEAD funding must include a statement from the department head indicating support for the proposal.

4. The FEAD Committee shall review proposals and make funding recommendations to the dean of the college. If the dean of the college does not concur with the recommendations made by the college’s FEAD Committee, the dean shall communicate this objection to the committee and an informal resolution shall be pursued. In situations where the dean and the committee cannot reach a resolution regarding a FEAD award, the provost shall be the final arbiter.

5. The dean of the college shall be responsible for the disbursement of faculty development awards.

Responsible Office: Academic Senate and Office of the Provost. Inquiries can be directed to:

Academic Senate
asenate@rit.edu