

Please check faculty status:

☐ Tenured Faculty Member

☐ Lecturer

☐ Tenure Track Faculty Member (MUST complete pg. 5)

☐ Other (*state status*) \_\_\_\_\_

## NTID FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW

<b>FACULTY MEMBER</b>	<b>CHAIRPERSON</b>	<b>PERIOD</b>
		<b>FROM:</b> _____ <b>TO:</b> _____

### REVIEW POLICY

Faculty members who have been employed for one semester or longer shall be formally reviewed annually by their department chairperson.

#### RIT POLICY ON ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY (E7.0)

##### I. Preamble

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 on Annual Review of Faculty 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:

1. Encourage and foster continued professional development;
2. Provide part of the required documentation as specified in other policies;
3. Promote the improvement of individual performance; and,
4. 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.

This policy assumes the dignity and academic freedom of individual faculty members, and its implementation shall be guided by mutual trust.

##### II. Review Process

- A. All full-time faculty at Rochester Institute of Technology will participate in an annual performance review.
- B. 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.
- C. The performance categories for evaluating all faculty members shall be: Outstanding, Very Good, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory.
- D. 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.
- E. Each college's review process must include the following elements:
  1. Plan of Work
    - a. A 17-month plan of work generated by the faculty member that outlines the faculty member's goals for teaching, scholarship, and service for the period from January 1 through the end of the spring term of the following academic year. The third semester long range planning would not be considered part of the current year's evaluation.
    - b. Faculty may also include how the plan of work goals fit with their longer term performance aspirations.
    - c. Each college or department may have their own published guidelines for developing a plan of work.
    - d. Each faculty member's negotiated plan of work will include specific performance criteria and how these will be applied and weighted.
    - e. The plan of work shall be approved by the department chair and dean and shall be available for inspection by members of the department.
  2. The faculty member's written self-evaluation and evidence of performance in 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 questions on the university-wide student rating of instruction survey for all sections taught during each semester, accessible through the RIT Student Rating System at a disaggregated level. 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; as appropriate. 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.
4. 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 review period. Based on this meeting, the plan of work may then be modified by the faculty member to address concerns raised in the annual review. 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.
5. Faculty members who believe that 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**

- A. 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.
- B. Tenure-track faculty who are rated as Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory in either teaching or scholarship shall be eligible for funds from the Faculty Improvement Fund (FIF). Each faculty member eligible for FIF funds must work with their department head to develop and implement an appropriate plan of improvement. The funds will be distributed by the dean.
- C. Tenure-track faculty and senior and principal lecturers are eligible for funds from the Faculty Education and Development (FEAD) fund. These funds will be appropriated by the university to each college in proportion to the number of tenure-track faculty and senior and principal lecturers in each college. Disbursement of these funds will proceed as follows:
  1. Each college will 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 will 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 will 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 will be the final arbiter.
  5. The dean of the college shall be responsible for the disbursement of faculty development awards.

Revised May 16, 2013

## **GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS for ANNUAL REVIEW**

The chairperson's review is based on achievement of performance objectives for the period January 1 to December 31 in the current POW.

The chairperson's review, the faculty member's self-appraisal and future plan of work together make up the appraisal package, which must be completed and provided to the office of the president/dean by April 15.

### **REVIEW PROCEDURES**

#### **Steps**

1. The faculty member presents self-appraisal to chair or immediate supervisor by the end of the second week of Interession. The self-appraisal should include documentation that addresses the extent to which performance objectives in the POW have been satisfied, including ongoing participation in learning activities/efforts to maintain and improve communication skills, development of skill in sign language and sensitivity to deaf cultural issues, and development of spoken communication strategies and techniques. The self-appraisal must include standardized student evaluations for all sections taught. Faculty, all or part of whose POW is devoted to tutoring, are also expected to submit student evaluations.
2. The chairperson completes the annual review document, assigns a performance rating, and shares with the faculty member. In the case of a pre-tenured tenure-track faculty member, the chairperson also completes the statement regarding tenure.
3. The faculty member reviews chairperson's comments and rating, provides a response (at his/her option), signs and dates the document, and returns it to chairperson.
4. In the case of a tenured faculty member or lecturer, the associate VP for academic affairs (AVP) provides comments (at his/her option) and signs and dates.  
In the case of non-tenured faculty in a tenure track, the AVP provides evaluative comments, signs and dates.
5. If the AVP adds comments, the document is returned to the chairperson who shares it with the faculty member for his/her review. The faculty member may add a response if desired, signs and dates, and returns to chairperson.

#### **Statement regarding tenure**

A statement regarding tenure must be completed by the chair and the AVP for all non-tenured faculty in tenure-track positions as part of the annual review.

The chairperson is required to state whether the performance of the faculty member is or is not similar at this stage of the probationary period to the performance of past pre-tenured faculty who subsequently earned tenure.

Tenure decisions, which involve both peer and administrative review, ultimately depend on a variety of factors, including the candidate's performance in the primary area, scholarship, development of communication skills, ongoing professional development and service. The statement regarding tenure should identify both areas of strength and needed improvement regarding progress towards tenure. In reflecting the chairperson's judgment about where the faculty member stands in relation to progress towards tenure, the statement should provide the clearest feedback possible. In developing the statement, the chairperson works with the faculty member to ensure the elimination of factual errors.

The AVP for Academic Affairs will review the chair's statement and add his/her assessment of progress toward tenure and overall performance. These comments will be shared with the chair and the faculty member.

An opportunity will be provided for written response by the faculty member to the comments of either the chairperson or the AVP prior to the overall review package being forwarded to the president/dean's office.

## PLAN OF WORK

By January 31, each faculty member should have developed and had approved a plan of work to cover the period from January 1 through the end of the spring term of the following academic year.

The POW should list all performance objectives and include information as to how these objectives will be weighted and evaluated. Since expectations vary from position to position, it would be inappropriate to give equal weight to all expected outcomes and position functions. In all cases, however, communication skill development should carry a high priority. The POW should be developed, negotiated and fully discussed by the faculty member and the chairperson. The department chair must approve all POWs.

### Development of POW

List performance objectives for all relevant areas. Include a description of how achievement of these objectives will be measured.

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Teaching/tutoring, and/or other primary responsibilities. | _____ % of effort |
| 2. Scholarship and related professional activities           | _____ % of effort |
| 3. Communication development                                 | _____ % of effort |
| 4. Service   | _____ % of effort |

Changes in objectives which occur during the period covered by the POW should be documented, reflect mutual understanding between the faculty member and the chairperson and be confirmed with the AVP for Academic Affairs.

## ANNUAL REVIEW FORM

PERIOD: From January, 20\_\_\_\_\_ to December, 20\_\_\_\_\_

The annual review, which should be attached to this form, provides an assessment of an individual faculty member's overall effectiveness and contributions over the previous calendar year. The review should be supported by statements related to the individual's performance of objectives in the POW. Where appropriate, the review may include suggestions by the chair concerning performance expectations for promotion in rank. The review is prepared by the chairperson and discussed with faculty member prior to final completion.

The faculty member's written self-appraisal and evidence of performance are used by the chairperson in completing the annual performance review, which must cover the following areas:

1. Teaching/tutoring and/or other primary job responsibilities.  
Summarize evidence of effectiveness.
2. Scholarship and related professional activities.  
Summarize activities falling under the four defined RIT scholarship categories (E.4.4b), as well as related professional activities.
3. Communication development  
Summarize activities related to the development of both expressive and receptive sign language skills, sensitivity to deaf culture, and spoken communication strategies and techniques.
4. Service.  
Summarize activities and supporting documentation of contributions to the university and discipline outside the primary professional area as well as the use of professional skills for community and public service.
5. Overall Comments  
Summarize overall evaluation of performance. Where appropriate, include reference to what the chairperson will look for should he/she be asked to support candidacy for promotion.

Teaching/Tutoring (Other)	Scholarship & Related Professional Activities	Communication Development	Campus and Community Service	Overall Rating
(Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	(Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	(Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	(Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	(Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory

CHAIRPERSON'S SIGNATURE

DATE

## STATEMENT REGARDING TENURE

This statement must be completed by the chairperson as part of the annual appraisal for non-tenured faculty in a tenure-track position.

You will be reviewed for tenure and promotion to associate professor by the college tenure committee in AY \_\_\_\_\_.

Your Third-Year Comprehensive Review will be conducted in AY \_\_\_\_\_.

Your performance during the period covered by this review \_\_\_\_\_ is similar \_\_\_\_\_ is not similar to performance of past pre-tenured faculty at this stage of the probationary period who subsequently earned tenure.

Explain statement regarding tenure in terms of strengths and areas of needed improvement:

CHAIRPERSON'S SIGNATURE

DATE

COMMENTS BY FACULTY MEMBER: (additional pages should be attached if necessary)

I have reviewed the preceding and, at my option, have included the above response.

FACULTY MEMBER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
----------------------------	------

COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATE VP FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: (Required in the case of tenure-track faculty)

I have reviewed the preceding and, at my option, have included the above response.

ASSOCIATE VP FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	DATE
-----------------------------------	------

COMMENTS BY FACULTY MEMBER regarding Associate VP for Academic Affairs statements, if desired.

I have reviewed the preceding and, at my option, have included the above response.

FACULTY MEMBER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
----------------------------	------