

Austin Peay State
University

Annual Faculty Evaluation Review

POLICIES

Issued: January 4, 2017

Responsible Provost and Senior Vice President Academic

Official: Affairs

Responsible Office of Academic Affairs

Office:

Policy Statement

All full-time faculty including, but not limited to, tenure-track, tenured, temporary, non-tenure-track, and clinical-track faculty shall be subject to an annual faculty evaluation and development review.

Purpose

Annual faculty evaluation reviews shall be conducted for the following reasons:

- To provide faculty with feedback about the extent to which they are meeting or exceeding minimum performance expectations, as identified in the [Annual Faculty Evaluation Review](#) form.
- To discuss professional development goals.
- To determine the eligibility of faculty for performance-based salary increases or bonuses when funds are available.

Definitions of performance-based salary increases and merit salary increases are provided below.

Procedures

The [Annual Faculty Evaluation Review](#) ~~review~~ shall adhere to the following processes.

Instrument

- The [Annual Faculty Evaluation Review](#) form will be used for annual evaluation of all full-time faculty and published on the Academic Affairs and Human Resources websites.
- Should the need arise for the [Annual Faculty Evaluation Review](#)

form to be revised or replaced, the changes will be accomplished with input from the Faculty Senate and approved by the Provost.

- Each annual faculty evaluation is the evaluation of single calendar year. Merit based salary increases would be made on the basis of the average of the current and previous two years (i.e., a rolling three-year average).

~~Implementation Timeline~~

- ~~The Annual Faculty Evaluation Review will officially commence in the Spring Semester of 2018. All full-time faculty shall be required to participate. Tenure-track faculty may provide a self-evaluation to the chair 10 business days prior to the chair's report date as outlined in the Calendar for Faculty Personnel Evaluations.~~

Process of Review

- A review of each full-time faculty member shall be conducted on an annual basis in accordance with a timetable outlined as part of the Calendar for Faculty Personnel Actions.
- The relevant performance period for each review shall be the period of employment during the previous calendar year.
- Each faculty member shall provide an electronic updated curriculum vitae to the chair along with a listing of accomplishments in Areas 1, 2, and 3. Other documentation and supporting materials may need to be provided as determined by the chair via advance consultation with the faculty member.
- Tenure-track faculty may provide the same one-page narrative summary page which constitutes one of the required elements within the e-dossier.
- The faculty member may complete the Annual Faculty Evaluation Review form as a self-evaluation and bring a copy of the completed self-evaluation to the review session with the department chair.
- The department chair shall complete an Annual Faculty Evaluation Review form for each full-time faculty member in their department.
- The department chair will conduct a one-on-one session with each faculty member to discuss the Annual Faculty Evaluation Review form completed by the Chair. The completed Annual Faculty Evaluation Review form will be sent to Human Resources with copies to the appropriate College dean, department chair, and the faculty member.
- Deans shall evaluate chairs.
- Faculty who have been assigned administrative duties outside their department shall have two review forms: (1) review completed by the individual to whom the faculty does a direct report. (2) review completed by the department chair.

~~The faculty member under review will sign the Annual Faculty Evaluation Review Form acknowledging their receipt of an evaluation. The candidate's signature is not an indication of agreement or disagreement with the statements or scores. Appeals will not be considered without a signed Annual Evaluation Review Form on file.~~

Focus of Review

Each review will include a quantitative/numerical component and a qualitative/narrative component.

- The quantitative/numerical component will consist of ratings of faculty by the chair on performance in areas pertinent to their faculty appointment. Chairs ~~shall~~ are permitted to use half-integers ~~whole numbers~~ when assigning the performance value.
- An overall composite rating (OCR) will be derived for each member using a method for weighting the performance by distribution of effort. A faculty member's overall composite score will determine her/his eligibility for appropriate salary increases or bonuses consistent with the current compensation plan.
- ~~The faculty member under review will sign the Annual Faculty Evaluation Review Form acknowledging their receipt of an evaluation. The candidate's signature is not an indication of agreement or disagreement with the statements or scores. Appeals will not be considered without a signed Annual Evaluation Review Form on file.~~
- ~~The qualitative/narrative component will consist of written comments that reflect faculty performance, and future aspirations on each of the relevant performance area responsibilities.~~

Process of Appeal

•—A faculty member may appeal the review of the Chair within five ~~ten~~ (105) business days on the following grounds:

- Errors and misrepresentation in how the performance of the faculty member has been characterized by the chair in the qualitative/narrative portion of the review.
- Inappropriate weighting of performance dimensions or incorrect calculation of overall composite score.
- The faculty member will prepare a written, narrative appeal addressing the applicability of the relevant grounds for appeal and submit it to his/her dean.
- The dean will review the appeal to determine if it has merit and, if necessary, work with the department chair to make appropriate adjustments

in the review.

- The dean will reply with a decision within ten (10) days from date of ~~signature or receipt of evaluation~~the appeal. An extension may be granted by the Provost upon requested ~~from theby the d~~Dean-to-the Provost.
- If the faculty member under review wishes to contest the decanal decision, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost within ~~five (5)~~ten (10) business days from the date of the dean's decision. The Provost's decision is final.

Post-Tenure Improvement

Tenured faculty who fail to receive a satisfactory Annual Faculty Evaluation Review will be asked to participate in the creation of an improvement plan.

- A ~~composite~~score of ~~less than 3~~ (Below Expectations) or less in Area 1 or 3 than 2 shall initiate a post-tenure improvement plan for that corresponding area(s) area. For Area 2, an average score of less than 3 for the current year and the previous two years (i.e., a rolling three-year average) shall initiate a post-tenure improvement plan for Area 2.-

The plan will consist of the following elements:

- One or more performance improvement areas agreed upon with the department chair.
 - Criteria and performance standards identified for each area.
 - Strategies/initiatives to be undertaken in pursuit of improvement to include, but not be limited to, participation in University-sponsored professional development opportunities.
- At the next Annual Faculty Evaluation Review session with the chair, the faculty member will report on his/her progress outlined in the post tenure improvement plan.

Definitions

- *Performance-based Salary Increase or Bonus:* A salary increase or one-time bonus awarded to full-time faculty who meet minimally acceptable performance expectations
- *Performance* – a collection of activities/tasks that form a coherent unit of work, e.g., academic assignment (teaching), scholarly and creative activity (research), and professional contributions and activities (service) pertinent to the faculty appointment.

Evaluation of the Policy

- The Provost, in collaboration with Faculty Senate, shall ~~annually~~periodically evaluate this policy in the context of the institution's mission and goals, and

evaluate the effectiveness of policy implementation, in order to continuously improve related procedures.

Revision Dates

APSU Policy 2:053 – Issued: January 4, 2017

Subject Areas:

Academic	Finance	General	Human Resources	Information Technology	Student Affairs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Approved

President: signature on file