



Annual Memo on Faculty Performance Reviews

Date: October 2024

The evaluation of faculty performance is one of the most important activities that educational unit administrators, working in close collaboration with deans and others, are asked to undertake. The purpose of the Faculty Performance Review is to provide recognition of faculty achievements, and guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development and advancement. The evaluation process is an effective means of communicating expectations, assessing faculty productivity and acknowledging and rewarding accomplishments, as well as identifying and dealing with performance-related issues in the spirit of continuous improvement. In addition, faculty performance reviews are an important source of information for promotion and tenure reviews. *Administrative Regulation 3:10* ("[Policies for Faculty Performance Review](#)") enumerates the policies and procedures for conducting performance evaluation of faculty at the University of Kentucky. This document provides a brief summary of those policies and procedures.

Annual vs. Biannual Reviews

AR 3:10 states,

"The performance of tenured faculty will be reviewed annually or, at the discretion of the dean, during the first year of each biennium with the rating applying for the biennium. Any tenured faculty employee, 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 keeping with the language of this regulation, which delegates the authority to each Dean to determine if tenured faculty members and senior lecturers in their college are to be reviewed annually or biannually, the Provost's Annual Memo on Faculty Performance Reviews will no longer state the year of the biennium. Information regarding the evaluation of both tenured and untenured faculty will be included in each edition of the memo. It is the responsibility of each Dean to maintain the biennial rotation of evaluation cohorts for their college (should they choose to evaluate tenured faculty and senior lecturers biannually, rather than annually) and to clearly communicate the cohort being evaluated each year to the faculty of their college.

Which faculty do or do not need evaluations:

If agreed to by mutual consent of the dean and a faculty employee on a terminal contract in one of the tenure-ineligible title series, a faculty performance review may be conducted, but it is not mandatory.

However, for faculty on terminal contracts for whom continued employment is anticipated (e.g. many research, clinical, and lecturer title series faculty) faculty performance review should be conducted.

Non-tenured faculty employees whose appointments will not be renewed do not need to undergo evaluation for that year.

Tenured faculty employees who will retire before or at the end of the current fiscal year do not need an evaluation for that year.

New faculty members must have an evaluation if they have been in their position at least 12 months. It is recommended that new faculty members who have been in their positions at least 6 months be evaluated. Evaluations of those who have been in their position less than six months are at the discretion of the Dean.

All educational unit administrators who have faculty on phased retirement shall take steps to ensure that those individuals are meeting or exceeding their unit's performance expectations in their areas of assignment; however, formal faculty performance evaluation for faculty on Phased Retirement is not mandatory.

Faculty employees on out-of-state assignments in international or other programs shall be evaluated for purposes of performance review based on their performance and accomplishments in assigned areas of activity in accordance with [AR 3:4](#).

For faculty members on official leave (e.g. FML, sabbatical, fellowship leave, leave with out pay, etc.), evaluation does not have to occur on the college's regular cycle, but evaluations should be completed when the faculty member returns from leave so that an unusually long amount of time does not pass between evaluations.

How are faculty who have joint appointments evaluated?

For a faculty employee with a joint appointment, where the secondary assignment comprises no more than twenty percent (20%) of the individual's total Distribution of Effort (DOE), the unit administrator of the department, school, graduate center or college in which the faculty employee has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty employee, with input from the unit administrator of the secondary unit. If a faculty employee's secondary assignment comprises more than twenty percent (20%) of the individual's total DOE, the unit administrators of each unit will evaluate the faculty employee's performance.

How are faculty associated with multidisciplinary research centers and institutes evaluated?

Faculty employees whose assigned DOE in a multidisciplinary research center or institute is greater than twenty percent (20%) shall have the activity performed in the center or institute evaluated by the educational unit administrator of that unit. The unit administrator of the center or institute shall report the merit score(s) to the unit administrator of the individual's primary unit. In cases where a faculty employee performs assigned DOE duties in a multidisciplinary research center or institute totaling twenty percent (20%) or less DOE, the individual's primary unit administrator will evaluate the activity performed

in the center or institute with input from the educational unit administrator of the secondary unit.

What policies and procedures inform the faculty review process?

Deans and educational unit administrators can help ensure the integrity of the performance review process by clearly communicating to faculty specific University and college policies that inform the faculty performance review process. Below is an overview of the salient University policies on faculty performance review.

Faculty performance shall be evaluated across all areas of assigned activity as recorded in the DOE agreement applicable to the review period. Faculty activity is broadly defined and includes: [1] instruction (i.e., teaching and advising); [2] research and/or other appropriate forms of creative activity; [3] service (includes service to the public, service to the profession, service to the institution, patient care unrelated to instruction, and other appropriate outreach activities); [4] administration; and [5] professional development.

Each faculty employee under review is responsible for preparing a summary of professional accomplishments in each area of assigned activity. For faculty with instructional effort, this may include TCEs, CELT mid-semester feedback, peer evaluations, learner outcomes, self-evaluations, or similar forms of input assessing teaching but does not necessarily need to be a traditional teaching portfolio. It is expected that the unit administrator will consider input from students, colleagues and administrators in determining merit ratings.

Results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty employee by the chair or director, and to the dean.

Reviews are to be based on the composite DOE across the review period performed by the faculty employee in each area of assigned activity. Quantitative and qualitative information will be used and explained in making judgments about performance.

The evaluation instrument or forms that are used in each college are to be developed by the dean of the college and must involve consultation with an appropriate faculty governance body. Letter, numerical, or descriptive designations may be used in the evaluation instrument, but the rankings must clearly recognize at least three performance designations: outstanding, good or satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. Evaluators are expected to be both fair and constructive. Evaluations must contain sufficient written commentary to explain the assigned ratings, especially in areas of activity in which a faculty employee has received a rating below good or satisfactory.

The unit administrator will recommend a merit rating for each faculty employee consistent with the rating scale adopted by the college for each area of assigned activity. A composite merit score shall be calculated by the unit administrator and recorded on the merit report for each faculty person reviewed in the unit. An individual's composite merit score is calculated by multiplying the merit rating assigned to an area of activity by the DOE percentage apportioned for that area of activity. The product of a merit rating for an area of activity multiplied by its DOE percentage is the *merit score* for that area. The *composite merit score* is the sum of those discrete merit scores. A dean may implement a college-wide practice of rounding all composite merit scores to the nearest integer.

The Appeal Process

All faculty employees are provided the opportunity to file a formal appeal with the college dean. The appeal may be based on a claim of procedural error and/or contested merit score(s) in the faculty employee's faculty performance review. Procedures for college-level faculty appeals should be developed and clearly communicated to all faculty employees within the college. If a faculty employee appeals at the college level and is dissatisfied with the decision of the dean, an appeal may be made to the Provost. At the Provost level a faculty appeals committee will be appointed and will make a recommendation to the Provost, whose decision will be final. Requests for appeals at the Provost level should be sent directly to Associate Provost Lisa Tannock at lisa.tannock@uky.edu.

2nd and 4th Year Progress Reviews of Probationary Faculty

[AR 3:10.B.4](#) requires mandatory progress reviews of untenured (tenure-eligible) faculty employees in their second and fourth years of probationary service. The policy requires that the unit administrator:

- Consult with the tenured faculty of the review candidate's unit about the individual's progress toward consideration for tenure in terms of the unit's expectations;
- Prepare a written review of the candidate's progress; and,
- Discuss the written review with the individual under review.

The discussions and the written progress review that documents those discussions, along with the reappointment process that operates in tandem with those progress reviews, shall be concluded *no later than* the last day of the individual's appointment contract in the second and fourth years of probationary service. Progress reviews may occur more frequently. The written review shall be sent to the dean of the college and a copy shall be given to the individual under review and one placed in the individual's Standard Personnel File.

Calendars for faculty performance review

The timing of faculty performance reviews varies by college, so from now on the Provost's Office will not issue a standardized calendar of deadlines for performance reviews. Instead, it is our priority that faculty members who wish to appeal their performance reviews have adequate time to do so at each step of the process. For this reason, I am recommending the following windows of time between steps in the review process. Colleges should set their own calendars based on their timelines.

1. Faculty members should be informed of the results of their review within approximately 1 month of the unit administrator's completion of the review.
2. Faculty members should have approximately 1 month after they receive the results of their review from their unit administrator to request an appeal at the college level.
3. Colleges should complete college level appeals within approximately 1 month of the request being made.
4. Faculty members will be allowed approximately 1 month from the time they receive their results from the college level appeal to appeal to the Provost level. Please note that the timing of Provost level appeals will be dependent on the availability of the Provost's Appeal Committee, so appeals requests received after March 1 each year may not be considered until the following Academic Year.

Please carefully document within your college the dates on which these steps are taken to ensure due process for the faculty members.

Finally, if there are any aspects of the review process on which you wish additional guidance, please contact the Office for Faculty Advancement.