

Post-Tenure Review Best Practices

In this report, Hanover Research examines post-tenure review practices at public, Midwestern universities that have a collectively bargained agreement with instructional faculty. Profiles are provided of post-tenure review practices at seven institutions, focusing on evaluation procedures and rewards and sanctions mechanisms for exemplary and unsatisfactory performance, where applicable.

Executive Summary

In this report, Hanover Research examines post-tenure review practices at public, Midwestern universities that have a collectively bargained agreement with instructional faculty. To this end, the report profiles the post-tenure review practices of seven institutions, focusing on evaluation procedures and rewards and sanctions mechanisms for exemplary and unsatisfactory performance, where applicable. Data or estimates for the number of faculty members undergoing review and their outcomes are provided for institutions for which this information was available.

The following key findings emerge from the research:

- ❖ The institutional policies reviewed in this report illustrate a range of approaches universities may take toward post-tenure review within the context of a collectively bargained agreement with faculty. Of the profiled institutions, **two have “full” post-tenure review processes that include or are linked to mechanisms for rewarding meritorious performance by providing salary increases, and acknowledge unsatisfactory performance by imposing sanctions that may lead to dismissal or non-reappointment.** These institutions are Fort Hays State University and Pittsburg State University.
 - **It is important to note, however, that even though procedures for responding to unsatisfactory performance exist, they may very rarely be implemented.** For example, a representative of Fort Hays State University indicated that of the roughly 200 faculty members, approximately one percent are identified as exhibiting “chronic low performance.”
- ❖ **Three of the universities** we examined – University of Minnesota, Duluth, Eastern Illinois University, and Governors State University – occupy a middle ground by **offering rewards for positive post-tenure reviews but limited consequences for negative outcomes.** For example, the University of Minnesota, Duluth may reward faculty receiving positive post-tenure reviews with salary increases, while negative reviews are met with concrete improvement plans for faculty. Further, annual evaluation processes at Eastern Illinois University and Governors State University may trigger other rewards processes for meritorious performance but are not linked to mechanisms for addressing underperformance.
- ❖ Finally, Minnesota State University, Mankato and Saint Cloud State University have **“limited” post-faculty review practices**, designed to support faculty performance and identify faculty strengths and weaknesses. The evaluation processes for these institutions **do not include and are not linked to mechanisms for rewarding meritorious performance or imposing sanctions for unsatisfactory performance.**

Post-Tenure Review Practices at Medium-Sized, Comprehensive Institutions with Unionized Faculty

Hanover Research employed the following methodology to gather information on post-tenure review practices at medium-sized, comprehensive institutions that have a collectively bargained agreement with instructional faculty:

First, Hanover compiled an initial list of “like” institutions by consulting the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s Institution Lookup and searching for institutions with the classifications “Post-Baccalaureate Comprehensive” and “Public.”¹ The search yielded a total of 85 results. Results were then narrowed to include only institutions located in the Midwestern states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Ohio, and Wisconsin, yielding 18 results. The list of institutions was then narrowed further to include only institutions that have unionized tenured and tenure-track faculty by searching institution websites and by contacting institution administrators, when necessary; 12 of the 18 institutions were identified as having unionized faculty. The final list of public, comprehensive, Midwestern institutions with unionized faculty, identified according to this method, is presented below.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ❖ Eastern Illinois University | ❖ Saint Cloud State University |
| ❖ Fort Hays State University | ❖ University of Michigan, Dearborn |
| ❖ Governors State University | ❖ University of Michigan, Flint |
| ❖ Metropolitan State University | ❖ University of Minnesota, Duluth |
| ❖ Minnesota State University, Mankato | ❖ University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire |
| ❖ Pittsburg State University | ❖ Youngstown State University |

Hanover then identified one or two contact persons at each institution, targeting individuals working in academic affairs or provost’s offices. Email inquiries were sent to each contact person and unresponsive contacts were also attempted to be reached by phone. Contacts were asked to describe their post-tenure review processes and to provide relevant institutional data, if possible. Information was also gathered from contracts/agreements between universities and bargaining units, which were often provided by contact persons. Hanover was able to successfully gather information from the following seven institutions:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| ❖ Eastern Illinois University | ❖ Pittsburg State University |
| ❖ Fort Hays State University | ❖ Saint Cloud State University |

¹ “Institution Lookup.” Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/lookup_listings/institution.php

- ❖ Governors State University
- ❖ University of Minnesota, Duluth
- ❖ Minnesota State University, Mankato

Profiles of the post-tenure review practices of these seven institutions are provided below.²

Eastern Illinois University

The review process for Eastern Illinois University is outlined in the “2010-2012 EIU-UPI [University Professionals of Illinois] Unit A Agreements.”³ The **annual post-tenure review process** for the institution is **limited** and is mainly used as a means of **identifying faculty strengths and weaknesses**. While it does not include rewards for exemplary performance, it does **trigger two additional, merit increase procedures** in cases where the annual review deems a given faculty member exceptionally meritorious. The annual review of tenured faculty is **not connected with any measures for exceptionally poor performance**. Further, this annual post-tenure review policy is separate from the more involved process undertaken for tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion from associate to full professor.

Annual Evaluation of Tenured Employees

Eastern Illinois University’s version of post-tenure review, “the annual evaluation of tenured employees,” is described in the Unit A Agreements document as, “**a limited process to identify areas of strength and weakness and to improve performance.**”⁴ The faculty member under review submits a summary of documentable activities demonstrating achievement in the three core areas of teaching, research, and service, to the appropriate department chair. The chair examines these materials, along with student course evaluations and documents from the employee’s personnel file. He or she writes a brief evaluation statement, which is sent to the dean for review, along with a copy of the statement sent to the faculty member under review. At this point, the faculty member may submit a written response to the evaluation for his or her personnel file. **In cases where exceptional performance is identified, faculty members are eligible to apply or be nominated for merit increases.**⁵

² Note that the post-tenure review practices of two of these institutions – Minnesota State University, Mankato and Saint Cloud State University – are governed by the same agreement.

³ “2010-2012 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreements.” Eastern Illinois University. <http://castle.eiu.edu/~acaffair/Contract/UA2010-2012CBA-Final-Sigs.pdf> from Dr. Blair Lord, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Eastern Illinois University. Email Correspondence. February 2, 2012.

⁴ Ibid., 32.

⁵ Ibid.

Note that these merit increases do not appear to be exclusively linked to the annual evaluation of tenured employees, as there are other means for being nominated for the awards beyond the annual evaluation. The merit increases fall into two categories – “Professional Advancement Increase” and “Achievement and Contribution Award.” These merit increases are specified in two additional articles within the Unit A Agreement and are discussed in detail below.

Professional Advancement Increase

The first merit increase mentioned above is described in the Unit A agreements as a “**Professional Advancement Increase (PAI)**.” Faculty members who have demonstrated exceptional performance, as documented in the annual evaluation of tenured employees, must meet additional criteria in order to be eligible for PAI. These include holding the rank of professor, having worked full-time within Unit A at this rank, and having not received a PAI in the past four academic years.⁶

The agreement further specifies that eligible individuals are required to submit an evaluation portfolio that is reviewed by the appropriate department chair, a department personnel committee,⁷ dean, and a university personnel committee.⁸ The recommendations of these individuals and committees are then submitted to the president for a final decision. The basis for granting a PAI is the demonstration of “superior teaching/performance of primary duties,” as well as either “superior research/creative activity and significant service, or significant research/creative activity and superior service.”⁹ With regard to interpreting the meaning of “significant” versus “superior,” the Unit A Agreement states elsewhere that the levels of evaluation include the following (ranked in order of degree of effectiveness):

- ❖ Superior
- ❖ Significant
- ❖ Satisfactory
- ❖ Unsatisfactory¹⁰

If the faculty member is found to have met the stated criteria, the PAI is added to his or her monthly salary with such salary increases recurring.

Achievement and Contribution Awards

⁶ Ibid., 44.

⁷ The department personnel committee includes Bargaining Unit A employees from within the department.

⁸ The university personnel committee includes tenured faculty from throughout the university who are elected by Bargaining Unit A employees. Each college within the university have at least one representative on this committee. Ibid., 29.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid., 25.

The second merit increase linked to annual evaluations of tenured employees is titled an “**Achievement and Contribution Award (ACA)**.” These are single-year awards that are available for both tenured and tenure-track faculty (and therefore are not exclusively connected to the annual evaluation of tenured employees). Individuals may make self-nominations, may be nominated by other faculty, or as described above, may be nominated through the annual evaluation of tenured employees. The criteria for eligibility are less stringent than those of the PAI: employees must have worked full-time for at least one year within the bargaining unit and must not have received an ACA in the previous year. Individuals may receive an award based on performance within one of four categories:¹¹

- ❖ Teaching/performance of primary duties
- ❖ Research/creative activity
- ❖ Service
- ❖ Balanced (the three previous areas considered as a whole)

Awardees are chosen by an ACA Selection Committee, composed of faculty representatives of each college within the university, as well as members of the institution’s Faculty Senate, Council on Academic Affairs, and Council for Faculty Research. Successful recipients are awarded an increase of \$107 to their monthly base salary.¹²

Minnesota State University, Mankato and Saint Cloud State University

In an inquiry regarding Minnesota State University, Mankato’s post-tenure review policies, Hanover was directed to the “Master Agreement between the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Board of Trustees and the Inter Faculty Organization, 2009-2011,” which remains the current contract.¹³ Saint Cloud State University also abides by the Master Agreement and follows the faculty review procedures described therein.¹⁴ **The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities’ evaluation and post-tenure review processes are designed to support faculty performance, however they are not connected to merit salary increases or sanctions.**

¹¹ Bullet points reproduced verbatim from source. Ibid., 45.

¹² Note that it is unclear whether the increase persists beyond the academic year in which the award is made. The exact language used in the agreement is “Each year, the Achievement and Contribution Award recipients chosen by the ACA Selection Committee shall receive a monthly base increase of \$107 per month retroactive to the previous September 1.” It appears that the awards are made each academic year by November 15th. Ibid., 48.

¹³ Sandmann, Warren. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. Minnesota State University, Mankato. Phone Interview. February 2, 2012.

¹⁴ “Union Information.” St. Cloud University.
<http://www.stcloudstate.edu/humanresources/union/default.asp>

Evaluation and Post-Tenure Review

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities' post-tenure review process is designed to **maintain and improve the effectiveness of tenured faculty members and follows the procedure of the regular faculty evaluation process for non-tenured faculty**.¹⁵ All tenured faculty members undergo an evaluation every four years. However, those below the rank of full professor must submit annual progress reports, while full professors submit a full report in year two and year four of the four-year evaluation cycle. Faculty members are also provided the option of requesting more frequent evaluations.¹⁶

Evaluation is focused on the faculty member's performance as measured by the following five criteria:¹⁷

- 1) Demonstrated ability to teach effectively and/or perform effectively in other current assignments
- 2) Scholarly or creative achievement or research
- 3) Evidence of continuing preparation and study
- 4) Contribution to student growth and development
- 5) Service to the university and community

The evaluation process begins with **each faculty member drafting a Professional Development Plan (PDP)** in consultation with his or her immediate supervisor that outlines objectives, methods, and expected achievements for the period to be covered in the evaluation (as noted above, this is a four-year period for tenured faculty members). Plans are submitted to the department chairperson, who, in turn, distributes it to department members, who are encouraged to supply constructive written comments. These comments are forwarded to the faculty member along with comments from the appropriate dean. The faculty member has an opportunity to respond to comments on the PDP in writing, which are submitted to his or her personnel file.

The faculty member must submit a report describing progress with regard to achieving his or her PDP objectives, along with supporting documentation, to the

¹⁵ Note that the Master Agreement specifically states, "Post-Tenure Review. For the purpose of maintaining and improving effectiveness, tenured faculty members shall be evaluated and shall submit progress reports as described in this article." See: "Master Agreement between the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Board of Trustees and the Inter Faculty Organization, 2009-2011." Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. 91. http://www.hr.mnscu.edu/contract_plans/documents/IFO_09_11_Contract.pdf

¹⁶ Ibid., 89-90.

¹⁷ Bullet points reproduced verbatim from source. Ibid.

appropriate dean.¹⁸ Like the PDP, the report is distributed to department faculty and comments are encouraged. The faculty member then meets with the dean to discuss his or her achievements made during the period in relation to the PDP and the five criteria presented above. The dean drafts an assessment of faculty achievement along with suggestions for improvement and future promotion.¹⁹

Governors State University

Through a phone interview with the associate provost of Governors State University, we found that the institution **does not have a formalized post-tenure review process**. Similar to Eastern Illinois University, Governors State does, however, offer a **limited “annual review process” for tenured faculty which identifies strengths and weaknesses**.²⁰ The University did consider implementing a more intensive post-tenure review process in recent years but any consideration of such a change was abandoned in response to overwhelming faculty resistance.²¹

The University offers an additional process under which faculty may receive a **Professional Advancement Increase** for exceptional performance. Again, this appears similar to the reward mechanism offered by Eastern Illinois University.

Annual Review Process

The annual evaluation examines faculty performance in the three main areas of teaching, research, and service. The submission of supporting documentation is optional. The evaluation committee identifies faculty strengths and weaknesses and may offer suggestions for opportunities for improvement. **In the case of markedly poor faculty performance, a letter is submitted to the given faculty member’s file, however this is admittedly not a very effective form of sanction.**²²

Professional Advancement Increase (PAI)

Governors State University appears to offer one of the same means of identifying and rewarding exemplary faculty performance as Eastern Illinois University. Using the same terminology as Eastern Illinois, Governors State maintains a voluntary

¹⁸ Note that the text of the Master Agreement states that the progress report is submitted “at the end of the evaluation period.” However, given the timetable outlined in the document, it appears that tenured faculty below the rank of full professor submit the reports annually and tenured full professors submit the reports every two years.

¹⁹ Ibid., 91.

²⁰ Note that faculty members at Governors State University are members of the University Professionals of Illinois (UPI) – this is the same organization that represents faculty members at Eastern Illinois University. See: “Faculty Policy, Procedures, and Personnel Manual – AY2011-2012.” Governors State University. http://www.govst.edu/provost/t_provost.aspx?id=2444

²¹ Woodard, Peggy. Associate Provost. Governors State University. Phone Interview. January 26, 2012.

²² Ibid.

Professional Annual Increase (PAI) process. Only faculty members with the rank of full professor or higher may participate in the PAI review process. Faculty enter PAI review by submitting documentation highlighting their contribution in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. This documentation is subject to review by a committee of full-time faculty as well as the chair and the dean. The committee forwards the documentation, along with its suggested outcome, to the provost and president.

Faculty receive an incremental pay raise in the case of exemplary performance. As noted by the University's associate provost, **applications for PAI are usually successful**. Further, faculty members who participate in PAI tend to do so as often as possible, which is in intervals of every four years.²³

Fort Hays State University

In a phone interview with an assistant provost of Fort Hays State University, we found that the institution does not have a formalized process called "post-tenure review." However the University does conduct a **Merit Evaluation**, which is linked to a **Chronic Low Performance procedure**. Positive Merit Evaluations identifying exemplary performance may produce awards in the form of **salary increases**, though this varies from year to year depending on available funds. Chronic Low Performance reviews confirming cases of continuing poor performance may lead to remediation in the form of an individualized improvement plan, or, in select cases, **dismissal**.²⁴

Annual Merit Evaluation

The annual Merit Evaluations conducted by Fort Hays State University assess faculty contributions in the three key areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.²⁵ Under the evaluation procedure, first, the faculty member **submits a written summary of his or her contributions in the three areas** to the appropriate departmental chair. The chair then evaluates these materials against previously accepted criteria and against the performance of other faculty members in the same department. The chair submits the completed evaluation to the dean. The faculty member may review and dispute the evaluation, and the dean is responsible for resolving any dispute. All materials are then forwarded to the provost, who reviews and evaluates the materials, ensuring institutional consistency. The provost then issues a recommendation to the president, who issues a revised contract to the faculty member, awarding salary increases, where applicable.²⁶ As noted in our interview with the assistant provost,

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Crawford, Christopher. Assistant Provost, Fort Hays State University. Phone interview. January 26, 2012.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ "Memorandum Agreement between Fort Hays State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors and Fort Hays State University/ Kansas Board of Regents." Fort Hays State University. 9. www.fhsu.edu/fhsu-aaup/MOA/

whether merit salary increases are awarded varies by year, depending on the availability of funds.²⁷ When salary raises are available, the percent increase varies by academic department, though departments generally establish a difference of at least one percent between their highest and lowest performing faculty members.

Chronic Low Performance Policy

Annual Merit Evaluations trigger the Chronic Low Performance process in cases where a given faculty member is found to fail in performing professional duties and meeting the department's minimum acceptable level of productivity. If a faculty member fails to meet standards in any given year, the department chair, in consultation with the dean of the college, produces a remediation plan. **If the faculty member fails to meet standards two years in a row or three out of five years, the University may dismiss the faculty member.** Dismissal for chronic low performance may be appealed.²⁸

Merit Evaluation Number and Outcomes

The assistant provost we interviewed was able to supply approximations of how many professors undergo the review process and of the frequency of the several possible review outcomes. All of the University's teaching faculty members undergo review, and there are about 200 faculty members at the University today. **Of these 200 faculty members, approximately one percent are identified as having chronic low performance and approximately 40 percent are considered exceptionally meritorious and eligible for salary merit increases (if funds are available).**²⁹

University of Minnesota, Duluth

With regard to faculty members served by the University Education Association, the University of Minnesota, Duluth adheres to the post-tenure review policies outlined in section 201.700 of the "Unit Nine University Education Association (UEA) Contract" – "**Review of Tenured Faculty Performance.**"³⁰ The contract explains that all faculty members are subject to an **annual merit review** that can result in salary adjustment. Reviews of tenured faculty performance are conducted at the same time as the merit review.

²⁷ Crawford. Op. Cit.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Note that the discussion in this profile only refers to faculty members represented by the University Education Association. See: "Unit Nine UEA Contract- Duluth Section." University of Minnesota. <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/policies/governing/unit9contract/duluth/index.html>

Review of Tenured Faculty Performance

The University conducts its **review process of tenured faculty using factors parallel to those used in the granting of tenure**, while allowing for the different stages of professional development. The expectations for tenured faculty members are established by the tenured faculty of each academic unit, under the authority of the unit's principal administrator (e.g., dean or director); these goals, however, are flexible, allowing for faculty members to contribute to the institutional missions of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service in varying proportions. The contract states, “[t]he goals and expectations shall not violate the individual Member’s Academic Freedom.”³¹

While the contract does not provide extensive details regarding the annual merit review (including what materials are submitted for the review), the document notes that if a principal administrator finds the performance of a tenured faculty member to be “substantially below the goals and expectations” of his or her academic unit for two years in a row, the principal administrator contacts the head of the faculty member’s unit. The unit’s head will then call the tenured members of the unit to examine the faculty member’s “file submitted for review” and provide a recommendation to the principal administrator. If the recommendation, formed by secret ballot, indicates that the faculty member has exhibited substandard performance, the principal administrator advises the faculty member of the situation and provides suggestions as to how he or she may improve.

Suggestions for improvement include a detailed description of the issue with the faculty member’s performance and **concrete steps which must be taken to meet the unit’s expectations**. The individual is provided a **timeline of at least one year in which he or she may improve**. He or she is also provided the opportunity to respond to the principal administrator’s recommendation.

Once the specified timeframe for improvement has expired, the principal administrator reevaluates the tenured faculty member’s performance. If the principal administrator believes that the faculty member has not sufficiently improved, he or she will again seek a recommendation from the academic unit. Tenured faculty members holding an equivalent rank or higher than the individual under review are asked to form a committee. The faculty member under review then has 30 days to submit materials that are representative of his or her work over the past five years. Based on these materials, the committee prepares “a report on the teaching, scholarship/creativity, service and outreach” of the faculty member, as well as provides suggestions regarding services that could help improve the individual’s performance. Ultimately, the faculty member may recommend the following:³²

³¹ Ibid.

³² Bullet points reproduced verbatim from source.

- ❖ That the Member’s performance is adequate and that the review should end
- ❖ That the **allocation of the Member’s expected effort among the teaching, research/creativity, and service/outreach functions of the program be altered for two years** so as to maximize the faculty member’s contribution to the mission of the University
- ❖ That the timeline for improvement be extended with additional specificity for improvement
- ❖ The Committee may choose to make no recommendations

The faculty member is provided an opportunity to comment on the committee’s preliminary recommendation, after which the committee will provide a response. The committee will forward the final recommendation to the principal administrator. The faculty member is provided a final opportunity to speak with the principal administrator before he or she makes a final decision on course of action.³³

Annual Merit Review Process

While the section describing the review of tenured faculty performance highlighted the potential negative consequences of a review, the contract also mentions the potential positive outcomes in relation to the more general annual merit review process. Once again, while the details of the process are not provided, the contract states that the University may **increase any faculty member’s salary on the basis of merit.**³⁴

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University’s policies related to post-tenure review are detailed in the contract between Pittsburg State University/Kansas National Education Association and Pittsburg State University/Kansas Board of Regents. While the contract does not use the phrase “post-tenure review,” it makes clear that its performance appraisal procedures pertain to tenured faculty.³⁵ As a result of such reviews, **in cases of exceptionally meritorious performance, faculty may receive a reward in the form of a positive salary adjustment; in cases of exceptionally poor performance, non-reappointment may be pursued.**

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ “500.000 Compensation.” University of Minnesota.

<http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/policies/governing/unit9contract/duluth/article500/index.html>

³⁵ For example, the contract notes, “Non-reappointment of a tenured faculty person may occur as a result of ‘cause’ which shall include ‘chronic low performance,’ as defined as receiving two consecutive ‘Unsatisfactory’ adjectival ratings.” See: “A Contract Between Pittsburg State University/Kansas National Education Association and Pittsburg State University/Kansas Board of Regents – 2011-2014.” Pittsburg State University. 17. <http://www.pittstate.edu/dotAsset/353418.pdf>

Performance Appraisal Process

With assistance from a dean, the department chairperson is responsible for evaluating faculty performance and developing a **performance appraisal document**. While the means of evaluating faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service may vary by department, they must meet specific guidelines outlined in the contract. First, the department chairperson must meet with faculty members prior to the start of the calendar year to set departmental goals for the coming year. Each faculty member then develops a statement of their own objectives and how they are relevant to the departmental objectives by March 7th, according to the current contract. After discussing these objectives, the faculty member and the department chairperson assign “each of the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activity/Creative Endeavors and Service a weight, the sum of which adds to 100.”³⁶ The weighting, which reflects the faculty member’s objectives and the needs of the department, must conform to the ranges specified in the figure below.

Figure 1: Pittsburg State University Faculty Responsibility Distribution Ranges

Component of Faculty Responsibility	Range of Workload Percentage
Teaching	50-70
Scholarly Activity/Creative Endeavors	20-40
Service	10-30

Source: Pittsburg State University.

The objectives and weighting are finalized by the department chairperson by March 15th and are provided to the faculty member.

At the start of the spring semester (of the following year), **the faculty member submits a report of his or her accomplishments** to the department chairperson. The contract notes that faculty members holding the rank of “University Professor, Professor, or Associate Professor” who have received a rating of “Meritorious Annual Performance” or “Exceptional Annual Performance” in the previous year are not required to submit a report and will receive a rating of Meritorious Annual Performance for the year. This option may not be taken in consecutive years.³⁷

The department chairperson reviews the report submitted by the faculty members in the context of the previously agreed upon objectives and weightings. Based on this review, he or she assigns the faculty member one of the following ratings:³⁸

³⁶ Ibid., 7.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Descriptions in figure reproduced verbatim from source. Ibid., 8.

Figure 2: Pittsburg State University Annual Performance Review Rating Categories

Rating Category	Description
Exceptional Annual Performance	A comparative, competitive adjectival rating assigned to a faculty member whose overall performance is well above the norm in the judgmental areas of teaching, scholarly activity/creative endeavors, and service. This is a rating for which faculty must apply and provide appropriate documentation. Its threshold shall reflect substantial accomplishments in each of the three categories. It is a difficult but not impossible task to attain equal levels of high achievement in all areas simultaneously. It is more realistic to find high levels of achievement in some combination of teaching, scholarly activity, and service.
Meritorious Annual Performance	An adjectival rating that connotes faculty performance that meets and/or exceeds the threshold of professional quality that is normally expected of faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity/creative endeavors, and service. The University can normally and reasonably expect that faculty members will, to high professional standards of performance, meet their instruction-related obligations; maintain, exhibit, and advance disciplinary competency; serve their disciplines, community, and the University; and demonstrate good University citizenship. University citizenship requires that the faculty member cooperate constructively with his/her colleagues to aid in the accomplishment of the mission and goals of the University, the College and the Department. Faculty have a continuing obligation to engage in those activities that enhance their ability to serve their students, their respective disciplines and the University.
Annual Performance Below Expectations	This rating may be assigned when individual faculty performance does not meet what is normally expected of a full-time teacher, scholar, and colleague at the University. This rating informs the faculty member that she/he has failed during the past year to maintain an appropriate level of performance in those activities that the University normally and reasonably expects of its faculty members.
Unsatisfactory Annual Performance	This rating is reserved for faculty whose performance is deemed seriously deficient to the mission of the Department, the College or the University. This rating indicates serious deficiencies in performance such as a faculty member's repeated failure to comply with official directives or established policies; substantial neglect of her/his faculty duties and responsibilities; lack of professional competence in the performance of faculty obligations; and/or behavior which adversely affects the learning environment and/or the professional performance of others.

Source: Pittsburg State University.

After reviewing the evaluation, the dean and chairperson prepare an Annual Performance Appraisal Form that describes the rating. The form is then provided to the faculty member by March 1st. He or she has the opportunity to respond in writing, appending comments or other supporting materials to the appraisal, after which, the appraisal process is complete.³⁹

Salary Adjustments

Salary adjustments are awarded based on annual merit review outcomes. A specified merit increment is applied to the faculty member's base salary in accordance with his or her performance rating. Faculty with higher ratings receive higher increases, while a rating of Unsatisfactory Annual Performance garners no increase.⁴⁰

³⁹ Ibid., 9.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 10.

Probation and Non-Reappointment

After having been provided an opportunity to file a grievance, faculty members who receive a final rating of Unsatisfactory Annual Performance are placed on **12-month probation** by the University. These individuals will then be required to create a **professional development program** with the chairperson and/or dean. Faculty members who receive another Unsatisfactory rating at the end of their probation may then be **placed under review for non-reappointment**.

Non-reappointment reviews are conducted jointly by a faculty review committee, chairperson, dean, and provost. If the group unanimously agrees that “the performance deficiencies have not been removed or adequate progress toward improving performance has not been made during the professional development program, **the faculty member may be discontinued.**”⁴¹ Once again, the faculty member would be presented with the opportunity to file a grievance.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 18.

Project Evaluation Form

Hanover Research is committed to providing a work product that meets or exceeds member expectations. In keeping with that goal, we would like to hear your opinions regarding our reports. Feedback is critically important and serves as the strongest mechanism by which we tailor our research to your organization. When you have had a chance to evaluate this report, please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire.

<http://www.hanoverresearch.com/evaluation/index.php>

Caveat

The publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this brief. The publisher and authors make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this brief and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose. There are no warranties which extend beyond the descriptions contained in this paragraph. No warranty may be created or extended by representatives of Hanover Research or its marketing materials. The accuracy and completeness of the information provided herein and the opinions stated herein are not guaranteed or warranted to produce any particular results, and the advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for every member. Neither the publisher nor the authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages. Moreover, Hanover Research is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. Members requiring such services are advised to consult an appropriate professional.