

College of Agricultural Sciences Plan for Implementation of HR-40, Extended Review of Faculty Performance

Revised June 29, 2004

Purpose of this Document

This document was prepared for implementing the extended review requirement of the revised Policy HR-40, *Evaluation of Faculty Performance*.

General Guidelines

The extended review process is intended to help faculty members maintain scholarship in teaching, research, and outreach throughout their careers. What, in principle, distinguishes the extended review process from the annual review process is the requirement for a longer range assessment of performance and goals.

Specific guidelines for the extended reviews were established by individual academic units. The units reported their specific implementation strategies to the Dean before 1/1/00 and began implementation during the Spring semester of 2000. Whereas individual academic units have flexibility in establishing specific guidelines, all reviews in the College of Agricultural Sciences should meet the following guidelines:

1. Be performed at the Unit level.
2. Be constructive and conducted with the goal of faculty development.
3. Include the annual activity reports by faculty in order to reduce additional time and effort required.
4. Be conducted in conjunction with the annual review during the year when the extended review is performed.
5. Link faculty performance to available rewards.

Responsibility for Performing the Extended Review

Based upon the premise that the Academic Units are in the best position to evaluate their faculties' performance, the extended review should, therefore, be performed at that level. Each unit must establish a specific implementation procedure. The extended review may be performed by the Unit Leader, or by the Unit Leader and the Unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Recommended Procedures

Each faculty member will prepare a document for his or her extended review. This document will include:

- (1) The five most recent annual reports of faculty activities (including a new one for the most recent year).

- (2) A concise summary by the faculty member of his or her recent accomplishments, emphasizing program quality or impact.
- (3) A statement of professional goals and plans for the next five years.
- (4) Copies of the immediate past four annual evaluations which the Unit Leader will provide to the faculty member.

Individual units may include other documents, as desired. However, it is the intent of the College that duplication of effort is minimized and that preparation of the document is made as efficient as possible.

Following receipt of all documents and materials, the Unit Leader will meet with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance during the past five years. Following this meeting the Unit Leader will provide written feedback to the faculty member on the outcome of the review. The written evaluation must clearly state if the performance is acceptable or unacceptable. In the case of an unacceptable review, the specific reasons must be stated. This written evaluation is to be signed by both the Unit Leader and the faculty member. The signature of the faculty member indicates that the extended review has been shared with the faculty member and does not imply that the faculty member agrees with the results of the review. The faculty member will have the option to append a written response to the Unit Leader's evaluation letter.

In the case of an unacceptable extended review, the faculty member has two options:

- (1) To accept the results of the evaluation and to work with the Unit Leader to develop a plan of corrective action to attain an acceptable level of future performance; or
- (2) To not accept the results of the evaluation and to request a review by an independent committee whose composition will be determined by the specific guidelines of the individual academic unit.

If results are not accepted by the faculty member, the independent review committee shall be given all written documentation to include the following: (1) the Unit Leader's evaluative report, (2) any written response by the faculty member, and (3) all documentation used in the Unit Leader's evaluative report, including the Unit Leader's annual evaluation statements from the past five years. At its discretion, the review committee may invite the faculty member and/or the Unit Leader to meet with the committee. The committee will prepare a letter to the Unit Leader that states whether the committee agrees or disagrees with the Unit Leader's evaluations and will provide reasons for the committee's decision. If the committee concurs with the Unit Leader's decision, the faculty member and the Unit Leader shall prepare an updated plan for corrective action. If the committee does not concur with the Unit Leader's decision, the Unit Leader has two options:

- (1) To concur with the review committee by changing his or her evaluative rating of the faculty member from unacceptable to acceptable and then to draft a revised evaluative report to be signed by both the faculty member and the Unit Leader; or

- (2) To not concur with the review committee and to request that the Dean review all documentation and render a decision. At his or her discretion, the Dean may invite the faculty member and/or the Unit Leader to meet with him or her. The Dean will send a written decision to the Unit Leader and the faculty member.

Proposed Schedule

Every faculty member will receive an extended review at 5-year intervals after receiving tenure and/or promotion. For example, an associate professor promoted to the rank of professor on July 1, 2000 would receive extended reviews during the Spring of 2005 and again during the Spring of 2010, etc.

Reporting the Results of the Extended Review

The results of an extended review, as with all annual reviews, will be reported by the Unit Leader to the Dean.