

College of the Arts and Architecture

Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance

In compliance with HR-40, the College of Arts and Architecture has devised policies for the periodic review of faculty to supplement the annual review. Plan approved by faculty January 21, 2000. At the direction of the Provost, this document amended by the College Faculty Council and endorsed by the Arts and Architecture Executive Council, July 31, 2000; revised by the Arts and Architecture Executive Council, June 29, 2006.

In general, the annual review process, already in place, provides information to unit heads and the dean about faculty performance relevant to merit evaluations; salary and workload adjustments; possibilities for promotion, tenure, or special awards; and other relevant matters that depend on the faculty member's accomplishments. It also provides regular feedback to faculty members on their performance. The periodic review mandated in the 1999 update of HR-40 supplements this basis of evaluation by providing an opportunity for a longer range look at faculty accomplishments and plans for the future.

The review will be based on performance in teaching, research, which includes creative and performing activity in the arts, and service. Each member of the faculty must demonstrate a career-long commitment to teaching, research, and service, though the characteristics of the contributions and the balance among them may change over the course of a career.

NOTE: Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance is an administrative process in which a faculty committee may participate. It exists outside the Promotion and Tenure process and is intended as a supplement to HR-23, which is by and large a faculty-driven process. Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance does not take the place of nor in any way supplant or supercede HR-23 procedures.

I. Who is subject to review?

All tenured and fixed-term faculty will be reviewed when they have not been otherwise reviewed by any body other than the unit head for five years and do not have an agreed upon retirement date attested to in writing by both the faculty member and the unit head within two years of the proposed review. This periodic review will replace the annual head's review in the year it is done and this review will take place in the sixth year following tenure or the last promotion.

II. Procedures:

- A. Faculty to be reviewed under this policy will be informed the previous year at the time of their annual review that such will occur.
- B. The review is to be primarily developmental and offer advice for continuing achievement. A faculty member undergoing an extended review normally presents the following material (as defined by each unit): a concise statement summarizing her/his accomplishments since the last review and goals for the future, a current curriculum vitae, and teaching/research/creative accomplishment portfolio.
- C. Either a faculty member or a unit head may request a peer evaluation prior to the unit head's review. If requested a Faculty Development Committee within the unit will conduct the evaluation. Membership of the committee may be the same as the P&T Committee, but it will be reconstituted as the Faculty Development Committee and comprise at least three members. In any event, only persons of the same rank or higher will participate. In those units lacking sufficient faculty of appropriate rank, the unit head will assemble an ad hoc committee of faculty from other units in the college or units with related programs. The committee will have access to the faculty member's vitae and annual reports, and the unit heads' annual evaluations for the previous six years. The committee will submit a written evaluation to the unit head.
- D. The unit head will review the materials, and write an evaluative commentary, based on the faculty member's job assignment, and the longer range outlook and plans for the future of the faculty member. The head will meet with the faculty member and present and discuss the evaluation. Such discussion will include suggestions for changes in direction of the assignments and activities of the faculty member if any are appropriate. If plans to improve performance are warranted, the unit head will work with the faculty member to create a developmental plan.

The head will give a copy of the Faculty Development Committee evaluation letter and his/her evaluation letter to the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member may respond in writing to the head if s/he desires.

- E. For faculty with budgeted joint appointments, the home budget head will consult with the head(s) of the other units where the faculty member has a budgeted appointment. For those campus faculty whose assignment is to a campus other than University Park but whose tenure home is University Park, the review will be conducted at the campus location, with input from the appropriate unit head, and the results of the review will be reported to both the dean of the College at University Park and the appropriate tenure officer on their campus.

- F. The unit head will submit to the dean the materials providing the basis for the review, the Faculty Development Committee's letter, the head's letter, and the faculty member's written response, if any. The dean will review the materials and provide a separate written evaluation. This evaluation should indicate agreement or disagreement with the previous levels in the review and any recommendations. The dean will provide the faculty member and unit head with a copy of her/his evaluation.

III. Timetable.

The faculty member being reviewed should submit relevant materials to the unit head on or before February 1 of the review year for distribution to the Faculty Development Committee. The Faculty Development Committee shall submit its written evaluation to the unit head on or before March 15. The unit head shall forward her/his letter to the dean on or before April 30, and the dean shall provide the faculty member with a copy of her/his letter on or before June 15.

6/29/06