

# College of Earth and Mineral Sciences Faculty Performance Evaluation

## BACKGROUND

A faculty performance evaluation for tenured faculty members was approved in principle by the faculty of the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences as a method for assisting and supporting faculty members to maintain vigorous contributions to teaching, research, and service throughout their careers. The basic rationale for such a review is presented in a statement in the *EMS Expectations and Faculty Commitment* document, approved by the EMS faculty 23 October 1996. It is proposed that the performance evaluation procedures be modified to take into account the evolution of the University-wide practice of extended faculty career development reviews.

The EMS faculty performance evaluation is intended to recognize and reinforce the accomplishments of the many faculty members who are contributing to the mission of the College and University, to encourage and assist those who can improve and do better, and, in rare cases, to identify those not contributing meaningfully to the well-being of the College or University.

The College will develop and maintain a separate but parallel assessment process for fixed term and non-tenure track faculty members. This procedure will operate within the spirit of the proposed tenured-faculty performance evaluation process, with sensitivity to the specific career development experiences of non-tenure track faculty members.

This document sets forth an implementation procedure derived from a proposal of the EMS Faculty Performance Review Committee, an *ad hoc* group created in response to the faculty approval in principle of a faculty performance evaluation. The document has subsequently been modified to reflect University Faculty Senate sentiments regarding the efficacy and implementation of the extended review. The elected College Faculty Advisory Committee drafted the revision, which follows.

## FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION

The evaluation of the performance of tenured EMS faculty members will be based on the criteria established by a statement in the *EMS Expectations and Faculty Commitment* document:

The primary responsibility of each member of the EMS faculty is to contribute to the achievements of the University and the College in fostering the intellectual growth and progress of students, in advancing knowledge and understanding, and in serving society. To meet this responsibility, each member of the faculty must maintain and demonstrate a deep and career-long commitment to improving both personal and College capabilities in teaching, research, and service. It is recognized that the characteristics of the contributions and the balance between them may change as a career proceeds.

To enhance the strength of the College and to further the objective of maintaining vitality in teaching, research, and service throughout an academic career, the members of the EMS faculty accept and welcome increasing responsibility for the success of the College through a variety of activities, [such as]:

- Developing and participating in a program of College-wide peer evaluation to improve EMS classroom teaching
- Mentoring junior faculty
- Developing and maintaining key contacts in industry and government
- Seeking professional recognition and awards for deserving colleagues
- Fostering meaningful interaction with students outside of class
- Serving in a governance capacity in support of departmental, College, or University goals

## PROCEDURE GOVERNING THE EVALUATION

The EMS faculty member will be notified (via email) two semesters in advance of the upcoming review. In late fall semester, the Dean will send a letter to the faculty member requesting the submission of a two-to-three page self-study document that discusses accomplishments of the past five years, evolving interests, and a plan for the next five years. Discussion of accomplishments should be restricted only to the previous five years. This document will be provided to the Department Head.

The Department Head will provide the following:

- a. A numerical summary of courses taught and SRTes received over the past five years;
- b. A summary of research support received by the faculty member over the previous five years (working with the Office of the Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Research).
- c. A single summary letter reviewing the previous five years and reflecting on future plans.

The faculty member's self-study document along with the materials prepared by the Department Head should be submitted to the Dean's Office. One original copy of all materials along with an electronic copy in pdf (not scanned) format should be submitted. Outside letters will not be solicited nor considered as part of the review.

The Dean shall meet with the Review Committee prior to each year's review to give a detailed charge and a summary of the review procedure.

The College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee will review the material and prepare a written summary and assessment following this standard review process:

- a. A committee member who is not from the reviewed faculty member's department should be assigned responsibility for writing the first draft of the Committee's review statement. Each committee member can expect to be responsible for preparing the first drafts for more than one dossier.
- b. Another committee member, preferably from the reviewed faculty member's department should provide detailed comments on the first draft.
- c. The final draft should be prepared by the first draft author after taking into account comments from the second committee member and comments from the whole of the committee.

The Committee statement should reflect both the consensus and the breadth of opinion within the Committee. The Committee's written comments should focus on recent past performance in accordance with College expectations, goals for the future, and include a realistic appraisal of the candidate's ability to achieve his/her goals. The Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee can include recommendations for action in support of a faculty member's career goals. The file and accompanying letter will be forwarded to the Dean.

A faculty member desiring to meet with the College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee as part of the evaluation will normally be accommodated.

The Dean will prepare a summary of the review that will normally blend the evaluations and recommendations of the College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee and the Department Head. Any independent evaluations or statements made by the Dean that are at variance with those of the other reviewers will be clearly identified and justified.

The Dean will forward written documentation of the results of these reviews to the faculty members. The faculty members will be furnished with written comments from the Dean, the College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee and the Department Head.

#### COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION COMMITTEE

One tenured faculty member from each department of the College will be assigned to the College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee. The faculty of each department (tenured and tenure-track) will establish and adopt its protocols for identifying its representative to the College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee. If a member of the College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee is scheduled for a performance evaluation, then the Committee will convene without that member present in order to perform the evaluation.

#### CONCLUDING THE EVALUATION

The Dean (possibly along with the Department Head) will conclude the evaluation by meeting with the faculty member and discussing the written evaluations. The written evaluations of the College Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee, the Department Head and the Dean's summary statement will be given to the faculty member at the conclusion of the evaluation.

The Dean, in conjunction with the Department Head, is responsible for initiating action, if any, in response to the evaluation. In the event that improvements in performance are necessary, the faculty member and his or her Department Head should work out an appropriate response, the implementation of which should be monitored by the Department Head. The Dean will be notified of the effectiveness of a plan to improve and enhance a faculty member's performance on a two and four year interval. Finally, a clear link must be established between the performance review and faculty rewards.

For the vast majority of faculty who are effectively carrying out the College mission, the evaluation committee should make recommendations as to the appropriate recognition of the faculty members' contribution and programs of enrichment and other institutional support that could further enhance the quality of their work. The evaluation process may also identify faculty who are in need of redirection or revitalization. In these cases, a development plan should be

formulated to help the faculty member improve his/her academic contribution. If appropriate, such faculty development plans will be accompanied by institutional resources and assistance necessary for their successful implementation. The Dean shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation and, if appropriate, recommend a plan of professional development. Any such development plan should be constructive in nature, and again, if appropriate, supported by institutional resources to implement it. In cases where a plan is developed, follow-through to ensure its implementation is required. At two and four year intervals, the Dean will review the progress of the development plan and, if necessary, make adjustments in the approach.

## SCHEDULE

The performance of all faculty members, regardless of rank, will normally be evaluated every five years after the award of tenure in the College, on the later of the next five-year anniversary of review for tenure or the most recent formal review for promotion.

Examples:

- An associate professor reviewed in 1995 for tenure awarded in July 1996 would have performance evaluations in academic years beginning in the fall semesters of 2000, 2005.
- If the faculty members were reviewed formally for promotion in 1998 at the department and college level, then performance evaluations would occur in 2003, 2008, regardless of whether the promotion was awarded.

---

**-Approved by the EMS Faculty 10/29/97**

**-Editorial changes (replacing “post tenure review” with “faculty performance evaluation”) to correspond with HR-40 revisions effective July 1, 1999 by JAD 2/8/99.**

**-Modified by the EMS Faculty Advisory Committee (to respond to the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, JSN 4/14/00) and approved by the EMS Faculty 10/30/01.**

**-Modified by the EMS Faculty Advisory Committee (to respond to policy HR-40 Evaluation of Faculty Performance approved by faculty senate on 12/11/07 and by the University President on 1/29/08) and approved by the EMS Faculty on 4/23/08**

**- Modified per recommendations of the 2011-12 Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee, which were reviewed by the EMS Executive Council and the EMS Faculty Advisory Committee, January 2013**