E7 Policy – Annual Review and Development of Faculty

Revision proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee
Summary of Changes
II A Faculty Review Process

B 1. All faculty at Rochester Institute of Technology will participate in an annual performance review.

II 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 shall participate in the annual performance review process as described below.
II B Faculty Review Process

B 2. The criteria for the review shall be consistent with the performance criteria in the Institute policies for tenure (E5.0) and promotion (E6.0); these criteria include effective teaching, professional and academic qualifications, professional activities, contributions to the Institute, and community activities. The application of specific criteria under these broad headings, and their weighting, may vary among academic units and among faculty members.

II 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).
II 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.

B 3. The performance categories for evaluating all faculty members shall be: Outstanding, Very Good, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory.
II C Faculty Review Performance Ratings

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.
II D Faculty Review Overall Guidance

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 should be rated at least Exceeds Expectations in each area.

Exceeds Expectations – For an overall performance rating of Exceeds Expectations, a faculty member should 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 should not have any ratings of Unsatisfactory. (con’t)
II D Faculty Review Overall Guidance

*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 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.).
II E Faculty Review Process

B 4. The time frame for the period of review shall be December 1st through November 30th.

II 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.
II F 1 Faculty Review – Plan of Work

II F 1 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.

Note: B 5 a. and B 5 b. regarding plan of work becomes II F 1 a, b, c.
II F 1 Faculty Review – Plan of Work

II F 1 b. As part of the self-evaluation, the faculty member's plan of work for the following year, and discussion on achievement of goals established in previous plans of work. The faculty member's plan of work for the following year, including how the performance criteria will be applied and weighted, shall be negotiated with the department chair and then be approved by the department chair and dean. The plan of work shall be available for inspection by members of the department. (Note: In all references to the department chair an alternative administrator may be substituted as appropriate.)
II F 1 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.
II F 2 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 members 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.

Note: B 5 c. regarding documentation becomes II F 2 a, b, c.
F 2 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).

1.
II F 2 Faculty Review – Documentation

Note: B 5 c. regarding documentation becomes II F 2 a, b, c.

II F 2 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.

1.
II F Faculty Review – Evaluation

Note: B 6. regarding evaluation becomes II F, G.

II 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.
II G Faculty Review – Evaluation Archiving

Note: B 6. regarding evaluation becomes II G, H. [B 7 regarding merit moved to I Rationale]

II 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.
II G Faculty Review – Grievance

Note: B 8. regarding grievance becomes II I.

II I. 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 A Faculty Development Process

III 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.
III Faculty Development Process

C1, 2 becomes III A, B, C and is essentially the same but reformatted except for the addition in III C. of non-tenure track faculty on multi-year contracts:

III 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:
E7 Policy – Annual Review and Development of Faculty

Motion 1: Academic Senate approves the revisions to E7.0 Annual Review and Development of Faculty which includes revised performance categories with descriptions as proposed by the FAC.