



Faculty Performance Annual Reviews Policy

This policy governs the continuing performance evaluations that are carried out annually for all faculty members and the procedures to be followed when performance of a faculty member with continuing faculty status (CFS) is found to be unacceptable.

1. Effectiveness in All Areas of Responsibility

Faculty members are expected to uphold the faculty standards described in section 2.1 of the [Rank and Status Policy](#) throughout their careers. Professorial faculty members are expected to engage in high-quality teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including mentoring of students. Professional faculty members are expected to engage in high-quality citizenship and other activities as described in their position description, including mentoring of students unless precluded by the position description. The allocation of time between these areas may vary among faculty or over a faculty member's career, depending on changes in assignments due to university, department, and disciplinary needs and opportunities. Failure by faculty with CFS to maintain acceptable standards of performance constitutes adequate cause and grounds for termination (*see* [Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy](#)).

2. Annual Performance Reviews and Interviews

The department chair, dean, or designee conducts an annual performance review of, and an annual stewardship interview with, each full-time faculty member in the department, including faculty with CFS. Department chairs have discretion to evaluate their adjunct faculty members. Departments are encouraged to have a department committee assist in conducting the annual performance reviews. Annual reviews and interviews are the primary vehicle for communicating performance expectations and monitoring the performance of faculty with CFS. The standard for judging acceptable performance will include the department's and college's rank and status expectations documents. It will also depend in part on particular assignments and expectations formulated during the annual review process, which may vary over the course of a faculty member's career.

In addition to serving as a regular, systematic process for reviewing each faculty member's performance over the past year, this review is the primary opportunity for department chairs to monitor and encourage continuous development and improvement, which is expected of all faculty members. Faculty should include in the materials submitted for the annual review a statement of plans for faculty development within each area of responsibility for the coming year. The interview should include discussion of time and other resource implications of the development plans. Department chairs should encourage efforts and support opportunities for faculty development.



Annual stewardship reviews and interviews should identify performance problems early, implement progressive steps to help a faculty member be successful in all areas of professorial or professional responsibility and create a record of discussions about performance problems and attempts made to remedy them. If a faculty member's performance is evaluated as below acceptable levels, it is the faculty member who bears the responsibility for resuming and maintaining acceptable performance. The department chair should take steps to see that reasonable efforts and resources are expended to assist the faculty member's efforts toward development and the maintenance of acceptable levels of performance.

A written summary of the department chair's evaluation, including clear statements of whether the faculty member has met expectations in each area of responsibility, should be given to the faculty member and kept in faculty, department, and college files. Annual evaluation letters should not be included in rank and status application portfolios because they are intended to be formative, not summative, in nature. They should, however, help inform the department chair's reports for rank and status portfolios.

3. Post-CFS Review

Generally, three consecutive annual reviews in which the faculty member's performance is judged to be below acceptable standards constitute adequate cause for termination of the faculty member's employment. Furthermore, a recurrent pattern of negative performance reviews over a period of years, even if they do not occur in consecutive years, may also constitute adequate cause for termination. These provisions do not mean that the university must wait three years or more before terminating a faculty member's employment. In some situations, immediate termination may be appropriate. In other situations, termination may be appropriate if the faculty member does not correct the problem within a reasonable period of time (see [Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy](#)).

3.1 First Year

Following an annual evaluation in which a faculty member's performance is judged to be unacceptable in any area, the faculty member must work together with the chair to produce a written work improvement plan detailing expectations and performance standards to be met, a reasonable time frame in which to meet the expectations and standards, criteria against which performance will be evaluated, methods by which satisfactory performance will be assessed, and specific efforts and resources that will be committed by the faculty member and by the department to the process. Both the department chair and the faculty member should sign the work improvement plan, and a copy should be kept in the faculty member's personnel file together with the written summary of the department chair's evaluation. These documents will be reviewed as part of the next year's annual evaluation. The chair notifies the dean of the results of the evaluation and the work improvement plan. The dean should evaluate the thoroughness and reasonableness of the evaluation and the work improvement plan and may



suggest modifications to the conclusions of the annual review or the work improvement plan as well as next steps to be carried out in the development process.

3.2 Second Year

If, after following the procedures outlined in section 3.1, the next annual review also results in a judgment that the faculty member's performance is below acceptable levels, the chair will prepare a written summary of his or her evaluation, including the implementation of the improvement plan, and share it with the faculty member and the dean. The dean will then review the case and conduct a performance evaluation for the same time period. The dean may enlist the participation of the college rank and status review committee in the evaluation. The faculty member may also request a performance evaluation by that committee. The dean, the department chair, and the faculty member will meet to review the evaluations and the prior year's work improvement plan, update the prior year's work improvement plan as needed, and take steps determined by the dean to be necessary to provide the faculty member with reasonable resources to allow them to achieve acceptable standards of performance. The dean will write a summary evaluation, provide a copy for the faculty member, and retain copies in department and college records together with the department chair's summary evaluation and the updated work improvement plan.

3.3 Third Year

Following the procedures specified in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, if the following year's annual performance review results in a judgment that the faculty member's performance is below acceptable levels, the chair will prepare a written summary of his or her evaluation and share it with the faculty member and the dean. If the dean agrees that the faculty member's performance remains below acceptable levels, he or she will send the records of the last three annual performance reviews, the dean's evaluation from the second year, and the associated work improvement plans to the academic vice president. The academic vice president, the dean, and the department chair will meet to discuss the performance record of the faculty member, the faculty member's efforts to improve, and the support provided by the department and college. Following this meeting, the dean, after consultation with the department chair, will submit a written recommendation to the academic vice president as to whether the faculty member's appointment should be terminated for adequate cause (failure to maintain acceptable standards of performance) at the end of the current contract period. The academic vice president will consider the recommendation and decide whether to terminate the faculty member's employment or propose other remedies. The academic vice president will notify the faculty member in writing of the academic vice president's decision.



3.4 Appeal of the Academic Vice President's Decision

Appeal of the academic vice president's decision not to renew the appointment of a faculty member with CFS for adequate cause is governed by the [Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy](#).

APPROVED: 14 Feb 2022 [Revised 16 Feb 2022]

PRIOR VERSION: 14 Jan 2008

APPLICABILITY: This policy applies to CFS-track faculty.

POLICY OWNER: Academic Vice President

RESPONSIBLE OFFICE: Associate Academic Vice President – Faculty Development

RELATED POLICIES:

- [Expectations of a Faculty Appointment Policy](#)
- [Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy](#)
- [Rank and Status Policy](#)