

Faculty Annual Review Policy and Procedures

All full-time academic faculty at Yachay Tech are to be reviewed at least annually following the policies and procedure outlined in this document.

This document contains the following sections.

- Section A: Policies and Procedures for Annual Review of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty
- Section B: Policies and Procedures for Annual Review of Lectures, ELP Instructors, and Tutors
- Section C: Formats for Reporting
 - *Faculty Annual Report*
 - *Faculty Teaching Evaluation*
 - *Faculty Annual Review*

Annual performance reviews of faculty members is conducted by the Department Head and the Dean (or by a faculty member or committee appointed by the Department Chair or Dean). This review may serve a variety of purposes, *e.g.*, to provide individual faculty members with information to improve teaching and guidance regarding research productivity and direction, to provide data that may be used part of an annual salary-setting process, and/or to provide the rationale for annual contract renewal processes for lecturers.

As part of this review, each faculty member must submit an *Faculty Annual Report* in the prescribed format (see Section C) that summarizes teaching, research, and service activities (for example, academic management and direction; service to the department, school, or university; and service to the discipline/profession) for the reporting period, as well as other information deemed relevant by the Chancellor, Dean, or Department Head.

The annual review will consider, as appropriate, issues of long-term research, instructional programs, or service which cannot be adequately represented on a strictly annual basis.

A. Tenure-Line Faculty Annual Reviews

Tenured and tenure-track appointments are made at Yachay Tech following the *Policy on Searching and Hiring Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty*. Tenure and promotion of tenure-line faculty members are done in accordance with the Yachay Tech Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty .

All full-time tenure-track faculty are to be reviewed at least once per calendar year (January 1 – December 31), beginning with their first full year of employment. Faculty who are hired between July and December are not expected to participate in the review process exempt from review in the first January of their employment. The annual review is related to, but not a formal part of the tenure and promotion process.

The annual performance review of tenure-line faculty members server two main purposes: (1) to provide individual faculty members with information to improve teaching and guidance regarding research productivity and direction and (2) to provide data to be used in the annual salary-setting process.

Annual reviews may be considered during mid-term and promotion reviews (see the RTP policy), but good annual reviews *do not* guarantee promotion because, among other things, annual reviews focus on one year, annual reviews do not include external reviews, and publications are not assessed in as much depth in annual reviews as in mid-term and promotion reviews.

All departments must have procedures for written review of tenure-line faculty at all ranks to support the annual merit process and to provide a basis for a clear statement of performance expectations and accomplishments. It is recognized

that provisions and practices in Schools and Departments may vary; however, all review procedures must incorporate, at the minimum, the principles included in this model policy for regular faculty review, and must be applied uniformly to all faculty in each academic department.

i. Principles

While some variation may occur in the approach to reviews, the following principles, as implemented by Departmental and School procedures, are to be followed by evaluators (*i.e.*, Deans and Department Heads) and faculty. In the case of faculty with joint appointments, a lead evaluator will be designated by the Dean. The process should be clearly defined by the established academic personnel policies and by the procedures of each Department.

- Each tenure system faculty member shall be evaluated on an annual basis and informed in writing of the results of his/her review by the Department Head.
- Each department shall have clearly formulated and relevant written performance criteria and shall provide these at the time of appointment, and subsequently as necessary, to all faculty to clarify expectations.
- The annual review shall include student reviews of each course taught. For tenure-track faculty, annual reviews in the 2nd and 4th year on the tenure track will be supplemented by teaching portfolios, peer review of instruction, and other measures of teaching performance.
- Faculty shall be informed of all factors used for the annual review, the review of their performance on each of these factors and the relationship between their performance and decisions on merit salary adjustments, contract renewal and, if appropriate, on reappointment, promotion and tenure. Faculty are entitled to have all of their assigned duties considered in the annual review.
- These annual assessments of faculty performance shall be reflected in recommendations to the Chancellor's Office regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
- If, after receiving the written review, the faculty member disagrees with its content or chooses to provide additional documentation or comment, the faculty member shall have an opportunity to respond to the review by submitting these materials in writing or by meeting with the chair or director. Any additional written faculty comment and/or documentation that is submitted within one month of receipt of the written review shall become part of the documentation for the review.
- The full documentation for this written review, including the faculty member's response, shall be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.
- Meetings between faculty members and unit administrators are encouraged prior to the written review summary to provide feedback about expectations and the review. Each faculty member shall have the right to meet in person with the unit administrator or designee after the written review is received.

ii. Outcomes of Faculty Annual Reviews

- If overall performance is *satisfactory* or better, faculty remain in the regular annual performance review process.
- If overall performance is overall *satisfactory with a deficiency in a single area of performance*, faculty enter into a Faculty Development Plan at the departmental level.
- If overall performance is *unsatisfactory* this results in faculty entering a Performance Improvement Plan.
- The Chancellor will provide an annual summary of the Dean's level performance review report to Academic Council and the CG by October 31 of each year.

iii. Academic Faculty Annual Review Timeline

- January: Faculty complete the *Faculty Annual Report*.
- February: Department Heads complete *Faculty Annual Review* and review their report with the faculty.

- by the end of the 1st week of March: Faculty sign and return the annual reviews
- by the end of the 3rd week of March: Dean reviews and signs the *Faculty Annual Review* documents.
- by the end of the 3rd week of March: Dean submits reviews and summary report to Chancellor's Office.

iv. Required Format for Faculty Annual Report

All faculty must use the required format for the *Faculty Annual Report* and all Department Head's must use the required format for the *Academic Faculty Annual Review*.

B. Policy on Annual Review of Lecturers and Tutors

Lecturer appointments at Yachay Tech are made to individuals who hold a PhD or the equivalent and have demonstrable skills and/or experience in teaching. Graduate students cannot hold lecturer appointments.

Lecturers participate in the Yachay Tech mission by being involved in projects that (1) are predominantly instructional and (2) are of a contractually specified duration. A faculty member on appointment as a Lecturer is primarily expected to provide teaching services to Yachay Tech undergraduate students and, to a lesser extent, to pursue other scholarly endeavors and university/community service activities. Appointments are for one-year duration with possibility for annual renewal. Lecturers are eligible for the same benefits available to other full-time university employees.

As with all full-time academic faculty, full-time lecturers and tutors are evaluated each year. The timing of the annual review is determined by the contract end date. This annual performance review is conducted by the Department Head and the Dean and serves dual purposes: it is used (1) to provide individual faculty members with information to improve teaching and other academic activities and (2) as part of the annual contract renewal process.

As part of this review, each faculty member must submit a *Teaching Portfolio* (see below) and a *Faculty Annual Report* in a prescribed format (see final page of this document) that summarizes teaching, research, service, and consulting activities for the reporting period, as well as other information deemed relevant by the Chancellor, Dean, or Department Head.

The annual review will consider, as appropriate, issues of long-term instructional development activities, research, or service which cannot be adequately represented on a strictly annual basis.

i. Annual Review and Reappointment of Lecturers

Lecturer reviews and reappointments are based on (1) documented teaching effectiveness; (2) evidence of effectiveness in other appropriate academic endeavors, as assigned; and (3) evidence of strong professional ethics and service to the university and/or community.

ii. Process for Annual Performance Reviews

The annual performance review, is undertaken by the Dean (or the Department Head or a faculty member or faculty committee to whom the Dean or Head delegates the review). The review must include a classroom observation and involve a substantive review of the Lecturer's record in teaching, other assigned academic endeavors, and service. The purpose of the review is to advise the Lecturer on how well he or she is meeting expectations and to provide a basis for renewal or nonrenewal of the appointment.

The classroom visit should be scheduled as far in advance as is practicable and in consultation with the Lecturer to be reviewed.

Prior to the classroom visit, the Dean (or the Dean's representative) reviews the pre-review materials prepared by the Lecturer (see details in C, below). Following the classroom visit, the Dean submits a performance review to the

Chancellor's Office using the *Faculty Teaching Review Form* and the *Faculty Annual Review Form*. The review form, with the Lecturer's response (if any), along with the Lecturer's *Annual Report* and current CV are due in the Chancellor's Office no later than two months before the end of the lecturer's contract period.

The review report should outline substantive suggestions for improvement, as applicable, and include a summary review of each of the following components:

- student opinions of teaching for every course
- observation and report on at least one class session
- course syllabi, representative student work, and exams
- exam score for all courses taught since the previous review
- an review of the lecturer's other academic activities

iii. Pre-review Materials (*Lecturer Teaching Portfolio* and *Annual Report*)

The lecturer shall prepare three documents in preparation for the annual review:

- *Faculty Annual Report* (format provided by the Chancellor's office) that summarizes teaching, research, service, consulting, and other academic activities for the reporting period, as well as other information deemed relevant by the Chancellor, Dean, or Department Head.
- A current (updated) CV.
- A *Teaching Portfolio*. The teaching portfolio must include the following materials and must be submitted to the Dean's (or Department Head's) office at least one week prior to the scheduled classroom observation session:
 - A listing of teaching-related activities during the time period under review (*e.g.*, teaching assignments, faculty development activities, and outreach and service activities).
 - A written self-assessment of teaching, service/outreach activities, and any relevant scholarship and/or professional development activities for the review period.
 - A statement of goals for the next year covering anticipated teaching, scholarship, service and/or practice activities as well as any specific plans for professional development.
 - Copies of all course syllabi and exams, examples of student work, and summary data on exam scores of all students in the lecturer's class sections.
 - Student reviews for each of the faculty member's courses.
 - Any other materials the faculty member considers appropriate for the annual review.

iii. Professional Development and Pedagogy

Individuals with Lecturer appointments are expected to keep up with developments in their discipline and with relevant changes in teaching methodology. As such, reviews of teaching performance may be improved by those who participate in some professional development and/or professional service activities. Although neither involvement in professional service nor participation in professional development activities is required, these activities may serve to enhance the lecturers' credentials and improve the annual reviews.

C. Report Formats (next pages)

FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT

Report period: January 1, ____ thru December 31, ____.

Name: _____ Current Title: _____

School/Department: _____ Tenure Status (circle one): non-tenure-track or tenured or tenure-track

A. SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATION:

List degrees completed during the previous year; list any courses taken or workshops or institutes attended.

B. TEACHING and ADVISING ACTIVITY:

List all graduate and undergraduate courses taught (as well as tutorials and independent study supervised) during the past year, including summer school and professional development courses taught or institutes conducted (whether at Yachay Tech or elsewhere).

Semester	Course Title	Course Type (Classroom, Laboratory, Field/Practicum)	Hours per week

Estimate the average number of hours per week spent advising students (outside of the classroom): _____

Graduate and Undergraduate Research Projects Directed:

Student Name (indicate graduate or undergraduate status)	Project Title (or brief description)	Faculty Role (Major Advisor, Committee Member, etc.)	Actual (or Anticipated) Graduation Date

Summary of Student Evaluation of Teaching (include summary chart and, if desired, a brief narrative).

Noteworthy accomplishments in teaching and advising (include curricular development, assessment activities, improvements to courses or laboratories taught, and any other teaching-related noteworthy activity accomplished during the reporting period):

C. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS:

Funding

Grant applications submitted during the reporting period (and still pending):

Continuing grants and contracts (include project year):

New grants and/or contracts received during the reporting period:

Publications (Please group by type of publication (e.g., refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, conference papers, abstracts, reviews, etc.), include complete citations, and note any publications with student co-authors.)

Work submitted for publication during the reporting year:

Work published during the reporting year:

Patents

D. UNIVERSITY SERVICE:

List administrative duties, university and departmental committee assignments, and other contributions to the university during the reporting period.

E. PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES:

List memberships, offices held, committee assignments, participation at meetings and conventions, papers presented, etc.

F. AWARDS RECEIVED:

List professional and personal awards received during the reporting period.

G. COMMUNITY SERVICE:

List participation in civil, educational, and cultural activities; include outside consulting work done as a faculty member.

H. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES:

List professional development activities that you have participated in during the review period. Include a brief narrative, if desired.

I. SELF-EVALUATION/OTHER:

Include a paragraph or two evaluating your own work over the last year. Describe the progress you have made towards the goals you set last year and include your goals for the year to come. Highlight one professional achievement over the past year of which you are particularly proud. List any other information you would like to include in this report.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Use as many sheets as necessary. Please retain one copy for your own file and submit one copy to your Department Head.

FACULTY TEACHING EVALUATION FORM

Faculty name: _____ Department: _____

Reviewer name: _____ Date of Review: _____

Percentage of appointment devoted to teaching organized courses: _____

Number of organized courses taught in review period: _____ Total enrollment: _____

I. REVIEW OF TEACHING MATERIAL AND EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Please respond to questions below based on review of syllabus, course materials, and student evaluations of teaching.	Yes	No	Comment (optional)
The lecturer's syllabi are well organized.			
Goals and objectives for the courses are appropriate			
Tests assess the material taught in the class			
Teaching evaluations are favorable			
Teaching materials (e.g., textbook, readings, etc.) are appropriate for the courses taught			
The courses demand an appropriate level of intellectual rigor for students			
Grading criteria are clear			
Lecturer is available to students for questions and other issues pertaining to the course			
Pass/fail rates are reasonable for the course			

Reviewer's Comments on Course Materials:

II. RESULTS OF CLASSROOM EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Name of course observed: _____ Date: _____ Time In: _____ Time Out: _____

Number of Students enrolled: _____ Number of students in attendance: _____

Organization	Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA
Begins the instructional session in a timely fashion.					
Provides needed information in a timely manner.					
Clearly states goals or objectives for the instructional session.					
Reviews prior instructional material to prepare the students for the content to be covered.					
Summarizes and/or distills main points at the close of the instructional session.					
Presents topics in logical sequence and flow.					

Reviewer's Comments on Organization:

Content	Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA
Selects examples relevant to student experiences/ course content.					
Presents up to date developments in the field.					
Provides content for an instructional session in an organized fashion.					
Demonstrates command of subject matter.					

Reviewer's Comments on Content:

Presentation	Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA
Communicates clearly using chosen delivery medium.					
Communicates a sense of enthusiasm toward the content.					
Presentation style facilitates student learning.					
Selects teaching methods and instructional strategies appropriate for the content, objectives, and chosen delivery medium.					
Relates current course content to previous and subsequent content Carefully explains assignments.					

Reviewer's Comments on Presentation:

Presentation/Interaction	Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA
Establishes and follows established criteria for class interaction.					
Treats all students in a fair and equitable manner.					
Respects diverse points of view.					
Establishes an environment that encourages students' participation and questions.					
Responds constructively to students' questions, opinions and comments.					
Provides corrective feedback to wrong answers.					
Prompts students to answer difficult questions and solve complex problems by providing cues and encouragement.					
Facilitates student to student communication and interaction.					
Is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge.					

Reviewer's Comments on Rapport/Interaction:

Active Learning (labs, field exercises, and/or in class activities) AS APPROPRIATE	Needs Improvement			Does Well	NA
Clearly explains directions or procedures.					
Facilitates access to materials and equipment necessary to complete the activity in a timely manner.					
Explains safety procedures when warranted.					
Allows sufficient time for completion.					

Reviewer's Comments on Active Learning:

Reviewer's Summary Comments on Classroom Evaluation (include remarks on areas of strength and areas that need improvement, as applicable):

Faculty Member's Response (optional):

Signature of Faculty Member

Date

FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW

Review period: January 1, ____ thru December 31, ____.

Faculty Name: _____ Current Title: _____
 School/Department: _____ Tenure Status (circle one): non-tenure-track or tenured or tenure-track

A. TEACHING ACTIVITY:

Evaluator’s Narrative of Teaching Performance and Contributions and Comments on Self-evaluation:

(Consider course instruction, individual or group mentoring, input from students, alumni and colleagues, course and curriculum development, teaching awards, development and dissemination of instructional materials and methods, and/or other education efforts. For lecturers – and as required for tenure-track faculty members – include the Faculty Teaching Evaluation Form)

B. RESEARCH ACTIVITY:

Evaluator’s Narrative of Research Performance and Contributions and Comments on Self-evaluation:

(Consider journal publications, conference proceedings, books and book chapters, pending publications, research presentations, grants received, proposals submitted, patents or other intellectual property, research accomplishments of advisees, and/or research awards or other indicators of research quality and impact.)

C. SERVICE ACTIVITIES:

Evaluator’s Narrative of Service Performance and Contributions and Comments on Self-evaluation:

(Consider internal service to the department, college, and university, as well as external service to the community and profession; describe leadership roles and effectiveness.)

D. OTHER:

E. EVALUATION MATRIX

Completing the workload percentages for evaluation purposes in the first row – the total should equal 100%.

For each column/criterion, mark the appropriate evaluation box with an ‘X.’

	Teaching	Research	Service	Overall
Workload Percentages for Current Evaluation				100%
Far Exceeds Expectations				
Exceeds Expectations				
Meets Normal Expectations				
Below Expectations				
Unsatisfactory				

OVERALL EVALUATION:

____ Far Exceeds Expectations ____ Exceeds Expectations ____ Meets Expectations ____ Below Expectation ____ Unsatisfactory

F. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S COMMENTS FOR CURRENT EVALUATION PERIOD

G. Date of most recent major review, if applicable:

_____ Mid-term Review date or _____ Tenure Review date

H. Department Head's Name: _____

Department Head's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Use as many sheets as necessary. Please remove instructions before submitting.

Faculty Member Response, if desired:

Faculty Member's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

I request an in-person meeting with my Department Head to discuss my annual evaluation: _____ (please initial)

Dean's evaluation:

_____ I concur with this evaluation.

_____ I do not concur with the evaluation (provide a narrative and a revised evaluation).

Dean's Name: _____

Dean's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____