

<b>UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY</b>  <b>ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS</b>	IDENTIFICATION AR 3:10 <i>(Formerly, AR II-1.0-5)</i>	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE 12/16/00	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED 8/30/88 6/11/92 1/18/96 8/18/98 10/8/99

### POLICIES FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The following University policies are to be applied in the conduct of faculty performance reviews:

A. The performance of tenured faculty will be reviewed annually or, at the discretion of the dean or president of the college, during the first year of each biennium with the rating applying for the biennium. Any tenured faculty member, upon request, shall be granted an annual review.

The performance of non-tenured faculty will be reviewed annually. Special attention will be given to the evaluation of persons in their first year of employment to maximize effective guidance.

In the University System, the Department/Division Chair will review each faculty member and recommend an evaluation rating to the dean/community college president of the college to which the department/division is assigned. The performance of each faculty member appointed in the extension title series will be reviewed by the chairperson of the department to which the individual is assigned and the dean of the college in which the individual's position is funded, using the evaluation instrument and appeal process of the college in which the individual's position is funded. For a faculty member with a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty member's effort, the chair of the department/division in which the faculty member has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty member, with input from the chair of the department/division in which the individual has a secondary appointment. If the secondary appointment comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty member's effort, the faculty member will be evaluated by the department/division chairs in the primary department and the secondary department.

In a Graduate Center, the Center Director will review each faculty member assigned to the center and recommend an evaluation rating to the Dean of the Graduate School. A faculty member who has a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment in a center or institute comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty member's effort, will be reviewed by the chair of the department in which the individual has a primary appointment, with input from the director of the respective center or institute. If the secondary appointment in a center or institute comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty member's effort, then the individual will be evaluated in both the primary department and the center or institute.

The performance of faculty on assignment in international programs or in other out-of-state programs shall be evaluated on the basis of their performances and accomplishments in their assigned areas of activity (refer to Section A of AR II-1.1-8).

Exceptions to these performance review policies will apply in cases of (1) tenured faculty who will retire before or at the end of the current fiscal year, and (2) non-tenured faculty whose appointments will not be renewed.

1. A primary purpose of the performance review is individual and institutional self-improvement. To help in achieving this purpose, the performance review will determine for each faculty member both a quantitative assessment and a qualitative judgment of the faculty member's activities during the review period in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, University and public service, and other appropriate activities with relative weightings based on a prior agreement pertinent to the distribution of effort among any or all of these activities.

2. To serve this purpose, inputs from students, colleagues, and administrators are to be used. Teaching, advising, research, and service assignments must be evaluated in annual and biennial reviews and in appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure. The results of these evaluations shall be considered in the decisions concerning retention, promotion, and merit ratings of each faculty member.

The assessment of teaching shall include the results of student appraisals for at least one semester per year, peer faculty appraisals based upon review of course syllabi, course materials, text, learning exercises, exams and in class presentation where applicable, and also other relevant information. Colleges, working through appropriate University bodies, shall develop some means to evaluate the quality as well as the quantity of academic advising done by each faculty member. As this procedure is developed and implemented, the results of this evaluation shall be considered in the annual performance review. The extent and character of each faculty member's teaching and advising should be documented by a body of supporting materials regularly maintained and updated by the faculty member. For the University System, such documentation shall include a teaching portfolio as outlined in Appendix I.

3. Evaluation of Collaborative Efforts: The products of collaborative and multidisciplinary efforts in teaching, research, and service shall be evaluated. The faculty member shall document the contribution he/she has made to the collective project. The appraisal of the faculty member's effectiveness as part of the collaborative or multidisciplinary effort should include evaluation statements by the other members of the team.

4. The quantitative data are to be provided at least once annually by the faculty member to the department or division chairperson through an instrument approved by the appropriate chancellor or vice president.

5. These data are to be supplemented by other inputs of the educational unit as pertinent.

B. Reviews are to be based upon the distribution of effort performed by the faculty member.

1. In any case for which an agreement on the distribution of effort has not been developed previously, the distribution of effort depicted by other approved instrument for the current year will be used.

2. During the spring semester of each year, the administrator of each educational unit (e.g., department, division, school, community college, or college organized as whole) with advice from the faculty of the unit will develop an overall distribution of faculty time for approval by the dean or president of the college or next administrative officer. In any case of disagreement that is not readily resolved, the decision of the dean or president of the college or next administrative officer will be final.

3. A written agreement is to be developed annually between the unit administrator and the faculty member on the distribution of effort expected of the faculty member in major activities during the succeeding year. For any faculty member who is or will be associated with a multidisciplinary research center or institute, the agreement shall be consistent with the conditions of establishment of the faculty position and signed by the faculty member, director of the research center or institute, the department chairperson, and the dean. In case of lack of agreement on the distribution of effort, the next higher level of University administration will become involved in resolving any issues. In case of a significant change in the faculty member's distribution of activities during the review period, an appropriately revised agreement is to be negotiated. An individual who is hired with the prospect of becoming a tenured faculty member shall be assigned duties by the unit commensurate with making due progress toward meeting requirements for tenure. The annual performance review of each non-tenured faculty member shall include some discussion with the unit administrator of the individual's progress toward consideration for tenure in terms of the unit's expectations.

4. The unit administrator shall consult with the tenured members of the faculty regarding the progress of each non-tenured faculty member toward consideration for tenure in terms of the unit's expectations. Consultation about a non-tenured faculty member who has been or is on assignment in an international program or in some other out-of-state program shall include, if the individual is eligible to be considered for tenure, evaluations of the individual's performance and accomplishments in assigned areas of activities in such programs (refer to Sections A and D of AR II-1.1-8). For each non-tenured faculty member who is associated with any multidisciplinary research centers or institutes, the unit administrator also shall consult with the directors of the pertinent centers or institutes. These discussions should occur at the end of the non-tenured faculty member's second and fourth years, but may occur more frequently at the administrator's discretion. The results of these discussions should be communicated to the individual non-tenured faculty member and a record maintained in the faculty member's file.

C. Rankings or ratings are to be used.

1. At least three evaluative groupings are to be used, whether letter, numerical, or descriptive designations.

2. The rankings are to be designed to recognize both outstanding and unsatisfactory performances as well as those appraised as degrees of good or satisfactory. Each academic unit must develop a clear set of expectations for satisfactory performance linked to the distribution of effort agreement.

D. An appeals process is to be developed for both the college and the academic sector (Medical Center, Lexington Campus, Community College System, Research and Graduate Studies, or Information Systems) levels.

1. On the sector level, under certain conditions and after being considered in the college, appeals can be addressed to the appropriate chancellor or vice president.

2. An appeal emanating from a college shall be considered by a committee appointed by the chancellor or vice president; after a hearing, the committee will make a recommendation to the chancellor or vice president whose decision shall be final.

E. The responsibility for developing the procedures by which the policies for faculty performance review are to be implemented in each academic sector of the University is centered in the office of the chancellor or vice president for that academic sector.

1. The colleges are the focal points to which the review procedures are delegated.

2. The dean or president of each college is responsible for the exercise of the procedures.