

Guidelines for Annual Performance & Planning/ Retention Review Process

Annual Performance & Planning and Retention Review Processes for Probationary Faculty Members

YEAR 1 OF THE APPOINTMENT

New faculty members are not required to have a retention or annual performance & planning review during their first year. After year 1 and up to year 5 of the appointment (unless they are granted early consideration for tenure), they must have both an annual performance & planning and retention review each year. In the year that a faculty member stands for tenure and promotion, a *retention review is **not** required*. An *annual performance & planning review is **required*** in the year of the tenure and promotion decision.

YEARS 2 AND 3 OF THE APPOINTMENT

1. Probationary faculty member submits review materials via Online Faculty Review and Retention System.
2. Tenured faculty members review probationary faculty member's materials.
3. A meeting of the tenured faculty for the purpose of discussing the probationary faculty member's materials is scheduled. The department head may attend the meeting, but may not contribute in any substantive way to the discussion of the materials.
4. Tenured faculty members meet, discuss the materials submitted by the probationary faculty member, and vote on whether the probationary faculty member should be retained for the following year.
5. A member of the tenured faculty is charged with drawing up a summary of the discussion and a report of the faculty vote to be given to the faculty member and the department head. To the extent possible, and while remaining faithful to the substance of the discussion, the summary should provide useful and instructive feedback to the probationary faculty member.
6. The department head meets with the probationary faculty member to discuss feedback from the retention review meeting and the faculty member's performance over the past review period. It is recommended that the department head also fold the annual performance & planning review into this meeting and develop with the faculty member a performance plan, which will form the basis of the next review.
7. The department head writes a narrative evaluation of the probationary faculty member's performance and delivers it to the probationary faculty member and tenured faculty via the Online System. Both have two weeks to write a response. *Separate narratives for retention and annual performance & planning reviews **are neither required nor encouraged***. One narrative should serve both retention and annual performance & planning reviews.
8. At the same time that the department head conveys the retention narrative to the faculty member, she or he should also make a recommendation on retention and rate the faculty member on the *Annual Performance & Planning Review Form*.

THE ENHANCED RETENTION REVIEW (TYPICALLY YEAR 4 OF THE APPOINTMENT):

There is an important difference in the materials required for the *enhanced* retention review and the manner in which the tenured faculty and the department head review those materials.

- The review materials should reflect the cumulative performance of the faculty member, since the initial appointment. The *Manual for Faculty Evaluation (MFE)* describes the required contents, as follows:
 - The file (which shall be prepared by the faculty member as a preliminary draft of the faculty member's file in support of a tenure dossier) shall contain: the faculty member's Faculty Activity Reports submitted to the department head in accordance with paragraph B.2.b. of Part II of this manual, computer-tabulated teaching evaluations, and annual retention reports compiled during the faculty member's probationary period; copies of research / scholarship / creative activity published or otherwise completed during the probationary period; teaching materials; evidence of research / scholarship / creative activity work in progress; a statement prepared by the faculty member describing other research / scholarship / creative activity in progress but not included in the file, a summary of service to the department, college, University, and other relevant constituencies; and any other materials that the department head requests or the faculty member desires to make available to the tenured faculty. (Part I.B.1.a)
- Just as the material for the enhanced retention review differs from that required for the regular review, so too are the tenured faculty charged to adjust the nature of their review and are asked to provide a different report.
 - Beginning in the year in which the tenure-track faculty member is the subject of the enhanced retention review process (or, for a faculty member who is exempt from the enhanced retention review process, in every year of his or her probationary period, even if he or she chooses to undergo a voluntary enhanced retention review in any year), the tenured faculty's vote on retention shall focus primarily (and increasingly, in succeeding years) on the tenure-track faculty member's ability to meet the requirements for tenure in the department, college, campus, and University. (Part I.B.1.c)

Annual Performance & Planning Review Processes for All Faculty Members

The *Faculty Handbook (FH)* mandates that every faculty member receive an annual performance & planning review every year (3.8.1). There are two exceptions to the mandatory annual performance & planning review.

- A faculty member in her or his first year of an appointment need not be reviewed.
- A faculty member who is on leave for the year need not be reviewed. Because the university has tied merit raises to performance reviews, however, the Office of the Provost recommends that a faculty member who is not on leave for an entire academic year be reviewed. If a faculty member is on leave during fall semester, when the reviews normally

take place, the annual performance & planning review can be deferred to the spring semester.

The steps in the annual performance & planning review process, as described in the *MFE* (Part II.B), are as follows.

1. The faculty member submits materials and other records of professional work, as stipulated by the *MFE*, the departmental bylaws and the department head. The materials include achievements during the previous three *academic* years. The faculty member also submits a plan for the upcoming year.
2. The department head reviews the submitted materials and the performance plan created at the previous annual review meeting.
3. The department head meets with the faculty member to discuss that member's performance during the current review period *and collaborate on devising a mutually agreed-to performance plan for the next review*.
4. The department head completes the annual review and records the results on the Online Faculty Review System. In addition to rating the faculty member in the categories listed on the *Annual Review Form* every year, the department head must write a narrative review at least once every three years unless the faculty member fails to meet expectations overall or requests a narrative. In these two cases, the department head must write a narrative and upload it to the Online Faculty Review system.
5. The faculty member has two weeks to respond to the review.
6. Faculty members who are judged to fall short of expectations for rank or fall far short of expectations for rank in the "Overall" category are required to submit an improvement plan to the department head within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed annual review. The review is fully executed when the provost has agreed with the overall rating and signed the review.