

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS OF CEHS FACULTY RULES AND PROCEDURES

Revised and Approved, April 2014

The introduction to the UNL Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty indicates that: *“the work of faculty members as independent professionals is not easily categorized or measured. Because it is inherently judgmental, the evaluation of faculty must be constrained by principles and procedures designed to protect academic freedom and to ensure accuracy, fairness, and equity.”*

The College of Education and Human Sciences has determined the principles and procedures it will use to ensure fairness, accuracy and equity in the annual evaluation process conducted by CEHS Departments and other relevant units. Those procedures are outlined in this document. Departments/units may have additional written guidelines to further clarify the expectations and standards established by this document that apply to their faculty members.

A. CEHS Mission Statement and Values

The College of Education and Human Sciences is committed to enhancing the lives of individuals, families, schools, and communities, and to strengthening the relationships among them.

The College provides state-of-the art education programs for its students and the people of Nebraska, generates knowledge through research, expands ideas through creative work, and applies knowledge through outreach and service that brings the resources of the College to society.

In pursuing our mission, the faculty, staff, students, and graduates of the College of Education and Human Sciences are guided by shared values that inform every aspect of our work. Specifically **we value**:

- ***Excellence in all aspects of the life of the College;***
- ***Innovation, creativity, and curiosity as we address the complex issues facing individuals, families, schools, and communities;***
- ***Respect for diverse people, ideas, voices, and perspectives;***
- ***Multidisciplinary approaches to scholarship that integrate teaching and learning, research, scholarship, and creative activity, outreach, and service;***
- ***Working together to positively impact the lives of individuals, families, schools, and communities;***
- ***Partnering with people in the community to support the mission and vision of the College of Education and Human Sciences;***
- ***Emphasizing the creation of new knowledge and its application to human and community needs, thereby combining the strengths of a research and a land-grant university.***

B. Faculty Contributions to CEHS Mission and Values

The mission of the College is accomplished through the contributions of individual faculty members to their unit and to the faculty as a whole. Different faculty may contribute in different ways to the achievement of collegiate objectives; some will devote more time to research, others to the classroom, and others to activities of outreach/Cooperative Extension. Because individual faculty members are hired to accomplish objectives of specific academic units, each person must be evaluated within the context of his or her individual appointment.

C. Essential Criterion for Faculty Performance

The most important criterion regarding faculty performance is that faculty members strive for excellence and continue to develop professionally throughout their careers. This portrays faculty careers as developmental and dynamic.

D. Need for and Purpose of Annual Evaluations

Annual evaluation is essential to document faculty achievements, to balance workloads among faculty, and to set goals for the future. Consistent with the Board of Regents Bylaws, Section 4.6, the performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their careers at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

The annual evaluation provides faculty members and administrators with the following benefits:

- a written record of expectations and accomplishments,
- a documentation of strengths,
- an ongoing critique of areas for improvement or growth as necessary,
- the opportunity to consider changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of the Department and the College, and,
- a set of base documents that support the annual distribution of performance-based salary adjustments and other rewards.

As such, annual evaluations assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the role and mission of the University, IANR, the College, and the Department/unit. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance, and provide support for promotion, tenure and other recognitions.

E. Nature of the Evaluation

The annual faculty evaluation process involves shared responsibility exercised by administrators and faculty in the various departments and units in the College of Education and Human Sciences. Primary responsibility for the conduct, quality, and presentation of an individual's work lies with the particular faculty member. Assessment of an individual's academic accomplishments includes an evaluation by the unit administrator and a review by departmental faculty peers as applicable. Subsequent levels of independent review are used to assure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among departments/units and to uphold College goals of academic excellence. Evaluation of each faculty member must be consistent with this premise.

F. Specific Applications

Annual evaluations are conducted for seven different categories of faculty appointments in the College.

(1) Tenure-Leading Probationary Faculty

Tenure-leading probationary faculty are on a tenure track, but not yet tenured; they have an appointment for a stated period, accrued one year at a time, as indicated in their letter of offer. For these persons, the annual evaluation provides information concerning the faculty member's contributions to the unit and his or her progress toward tenure and promotion. Tenure-leading probationary faculty undergo particularly rigorous annual evaluations that include a determination of whether their performance is likely to meet expectations for the indefinite future. These faculty members are evaluated annually prior to submitting their materials for tenure and promotion. The annual evaluation communicates areas of progress and strengths, and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies as soon as they are evident. Any concerns held by the Department Chair or the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or a peer review subcommittee of the department) regarding the faculty member's performance should be clearly stated in the written evaluation. The review will include specific recommendations for improvement and professional development that will enhance the faculty member's chances of eventually achieving tenure and promotion.

Annual evaluations should apprise probationary faculty members of performance deficiencies in time for them to take corrective action whenever possible. Occasionally, annual evaluations will result in termination prior to tenure review, and, where appropriate, terminal contracts; in these cases, notice shall be given in accord with the Board of Regents Bylaws, Section 4.4.2.

(2) Tenured, Not Fully Promoted

A faculty member normally will be promoted from Assistant to Associate Professor concurrent with or prior to an award of tenure; therefore, the annual evaluation of faculty who are tenured, but not fully promoted, will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative progress toward the rank of Professor. Not all faculty members will attain the rank of Professor, although annual evaluations should aid faculty in achieving that distinction.

(3) Tenured, Fully Promoted

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates much strength and few weaknesses; in other words, a full professor's performance represents distinction and excellence. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating Professors is to indicate how they are performing in relation to these standards, an important factor in performance-based salary adjustments. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels.

(4) Professors of Practice and Research Professors, Not Fully Promoted

Annual evaluations of professors of practice and research professors, not fully promote will focus primarily on strengths and weakness, on the best use of a person's talents to meet the Department's and College's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. Annual evaluations for these faculty members will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative progress toward the rank equivalent to Professor. Although not all faculty members will attain the rank equivalent to Professor, annual evaluations should assist faculty toward that goal. The evaluations may lead to adjustment of duties, and occasionally will lead to notice of termination.

(5) Professors of Practice and Research Professors, Fully Promoted

Promotion to ranks equivalent to that of Professor require a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses, in other words, a full professor's performance represents distinction and excellence. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating those who hold these ranks is to determine how well they are performing in relation to these standards, an important factor in performance-based salary adjustments. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage fully promoted faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels.

(6) Extension Educators

Extension Educators have faculty status and are aligned with disciplines associated with academic departments on the UNL campus. The primary function of Educators is outreach education to Nebraska citizens across the state through research-based programming that reflects needs of the local people and communities. Annual evaluations emphasize this purpose and focus primarily on strengths, program impact, skills that require attention for future growth, and professional development. Both quantitative and qualitative indices contribute to the evaluation. The annual evaluation is also used to guide extension educators through their promotion processes from assistant to associate rank, and associate to full educator rank. Annual evaluation for fully promoted extension educators is used to encourage performance at a high level of excellence.

(7) Lecturers

Individuals appointed as Lecturers are on non-tenure-track term contracts, which may be for 1 semester to 3 years (or in exceptional cases, for longer terms) and may be renewable (or not). There are no advanced ranks within the lecturer category. An annual evaluation is necessary for reappointment from year to year. Evaluations focus on strengths, ways in which skills can be improved, as well as goals and opportunities for the future as appropriate.

G. Mandatory Procedures for Annual Evaluations of Faculty Performance

The College, in implementing the annual evaluation process, is required to follow these procedures.

(1) Mechanisms for Communication

The Departments shall maintain formal and informal mechanisms for communicating to faculty, particularly new faculty members, what constitutes excellent scholarly activity in their discipline across the mission.

(2) Submission of Written Records of Activities and Accomplishments

Annually the Department Chair will ask each faculty member to submit a written record of activities and accomplishments for the previous calendar year. This record must be submitted using the template approved by the College.

(3) Performance Appraisal

ALL faculty members receive an annual written evaluation from their unit administrator. All faculty members who are eligible for promotion, but are not yet fully promoted, also receive an annual review from a committee of their peers. Fully promoted faculty members receive a peer review at least every three years.

(a) Tenure-Leading Probationary Faculty

A Department Review Committee (this may be the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee or a committee of another name with this same purpose) including tenured and tenured fully promoted faculty, provide written feedback to the faculty member and the Department Chair regarding the progress of each tenurable faculty member. The Department Chair makes an independent appraisal of the faculty member's progress, and considers the committee's written feedback. For faculty located at Research and Extension Centers, the appraisal of the Department Chair is made with input from the District Director.

The written evaluation of probationary faculty should clearly indicate strengths as well as any concerns the Department Chair and/or the Department Review Committee have regarding the faculty member's performance. Faculty members should be apprised of any deficiencies in time for them to take corrective action whenever possible. The review will include specific recommendations for improvement and professional development, to enhance the tenure-leading faculty member's chances of eventually achieving tenure. If a negative tenure decision appears inevitable, it is in the best interest of both the University and the faculty member to notify him or her of non-reappointment at the earliest possible date.

(b) Tenured, Not Fully Promoted Faculty and Not Tenure-Leading, Not Fully Promoted Faculty

Not fully promoted faculty members are evaluated annually by the Department Chair and reviewed by a designated Department Review Committee (or a Subcommittee thereof) using the materials submitted for the annual performance review. The Review Committee for tenured faculty should include a reasonable number of tenured individuals at or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed. Similarly, the review committee for research faculty or professors of practice should include a reasonable number of individuals representing similar

appointments and ranks at or above those being evaluated. Annual Review Committees may include a mix of ranks and appointment types as determined by each department.

The written evaluation should clearly indicate strengths as well as any concerns the Department Chair and/or the Department Review Committee have regarding the faculty member's performance. Faculty members should be apprised of any deficiencies in time for them to take appropriate corrective action. The review should include specific recommendations for improvement and professional development to enhance each faculty member's chances of eventually achieving the rank of professor.

The Department Review Committee provides a written review to the faculty member and the Chair. The Committee may also discuss its recommendations with the chair prior to providing feedback in writing. The Department Chair makes an independent appraisal of the faculty member's progress and also reviews the committee's written feedback. For faculty located at Research and Extension Centers, the appraisal of the Department Chair is made with input from the District Director.

(c) Fully Promoted Faculty

Fully promoted faculty are evaluated annually by the Department Chair and reviewed at least every 3 years by a Department Review Committee (or a Subcommittee thereof) using the materials submitted for the annual performance review.

The Department Review Committee may include a mix of ranks and appointment types as determined by each department, including a reasonable number of fully promoted individuals.

The written evaluation should clearly indicate strengths as well as any concerns the Department Chair and/or the Department Review Committee may have regarding the faculty member's performance. In the case of concerns, faculty members should be provided specific recommendations for improvement and professional development.

The Department Review Committee provides a written summary of feedback to the faculty member and the Chair. The Department Review Committee may also discuss its conclusions with the chair prior to providing feedback in writing. The Department Chair makes an independent appraisal of the faculty member's progress, and then reviews the committee's feedback. For faculty located at Research and Extension Centers, the appraisal of the Department Chair is made with input from the District Director.

(4) Meeting between Faculty Member and Department Chair to Discuss Performance

Prior to preparation of the final written evaluation, the faculty member will be given an opportunity to meet with the Department Chair to discuss his or her performance. The

Department Chair will provide a draft of his or her evaluation to the faculty member at least one day in advance of this meeting.

(5) Written Evaluation by the Department Chair and Feedback from the Department Review Committee

The Department Chair prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Consultation with the Department Review Committee (or a Subcommittee thereof) is required as part of the evaluation process and the chair's written evaluation must acknowledge faculty views.

Each faculty member who undergoes a review by the Department Review Committee will receive a copy of the committee's feedback as shared with the chair at least one day in advance of his or her evaluation meeting with the chair. Individual departments are responsible for determining what format the written peer review takes.

(6) Faculty Member Reviews and Signs Evaluation

The chair's written evaluation is reviewed with the faculty member and signed by the faculty member to indicate that he or she has seen the document. The faculty member's signature does not represent concurrence with its contents.

(7) Disputed Evaluations and The Right of Reply

If the faculty member disagrees with the chair's written evaluation, and the dispute is not resolved between the faculty member and the administrator, the faculty member has the right of reply. To exercise this right, the faculty member submits a written statement of rebuttal that becomes an official part of the evaluation. Both the chair's evaluation and the faculty member's reply become a permanent part of the faculty member's record. These records are forwarded to the Dean's office as a point of information.

(8) Written Evaluations Provided to the Dean(s) and the Vice Chancellor(s)

Copies of the Chair's written evaluation must be provided to the faculty member, the Dean, and the appropriate Vice Chancellor(s).

(9) Reappointment Considerations

As applicable, if the Department Chair, after reviewing the entire record, recommends reappointment to another stated term, this recommendation is forwarded to the Dean(s) following the annual evaluation.

H. Other Relevant University of Nebraska Documents

In 2003, the Office of Academic Affairs released a document defining faculty appointment categories: Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, Extension/Outreach (Public Service), and Service (Citizenship). This document is included in Appendix A. In addition, the College of Education and Human Sciences faculty has approved the means by which faculty assignments are made in relation to mission. Refer to the *CEHS Faculty Workload Guidelines* for this information. Specific information regarding evaluation standards for each portion of the mission in relation to promotion and tenure are outlined in the CEHS document entitled: *Guidelines for*

the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure. All of these documents can be found on the CEHS website.

References:

Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty: Annual Evaluations, Promotion and Tenure.
http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/tenure_guide.pdf