FACULTY EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Policy Number: CU-AA-64

Section 1. GENERAL

Scope: This policy is applicable to faculty, both full-time and part-time, regardless of rank or status.

Authority: W. Va. Code § 18B-2A-4 and 133 C.S.R. 9, Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Promotion, and Tenure.

Effective Date: 10/17/2024

Purpose
It is a standard of the Higher Learning Commission and best practice that faculty be evaluated regularly and that the University have processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles.

This policy has been enacted to establish and define the primary process for the evaluation of Instructional Faculty.

Section 2. POLICY
It is the policy of Concord University to evaluate instructional faculty to assure instructors are current in their disciplines, adept in their teaching roles, and meeting performance expectations as set forth in their job descriptions, appointment letters, and/or Board, University, college, or departmental policy.

Section 3. FACULTY EVALUATIONS
Thoughtful and candid evaluations encourage professional growth and development of the faculty and assist in making personnel decisions.

Faculty members shall receive a written annual evaluation of their performance directly related to the responsibilities and expectations defined by the University. Primary duties and responsibilities include, but are not limited to, excellence in teaching, scholarship, and University and professional service.

The written annual evaluation letter that summarizes the findings will be maintained as part of the faculty member's academic personnel file in the Office of the Provost for the duration of the faculty member's employment, as well as seven years thereafter.

Section 4. COLLEGE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
Each college of the University shall constitute a personnel committee to consider appraisals of performance and applications for tenure and/or promotion. The College Personnel Committee (Committee) shall consist of two tenured faculty members elected from each department and one tenured faculty member selected by the Committee from outside the college. The Committee is also subject to the following requirements:

1. The college Deans and Department Chairs are not eligible to serve on the Committee.
2. In the event there is not a tenured faculty member to serve as the department's representative, then a non-tenured faculty member from the department may serve.
3. For promotion or tenure recommendation reviews, one tenured member must be from the same discipline as the person being evaluated, if there is such a person.
4. In the event there is not a tenured faculty member from the same discipline, a tenured faculty member from another institution may be considered for participation in the review.

Section 5. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
The performance review for faculty varies by classification and tenure status.

Adjunct Faculty Review
Adjunct faculty are contingent or temporary, part-time, non-tenure-track faculty who provide instruction for one to three classes for a given semester. The Department Chair will complete an evaluation of adjunct faculty at the end of each semester with consideration of student and faculty input as available. The Department Chair shall provide feedback to the faculty member on the evaluation.

Full-Time Faculty Review
All full-time faculty shall have an annual evaluation, which will include the submission of an Annual Self-Evaluation, a current Professional Activities Summary (PAS), a current curriculum vitae (CV), and student course evaluations for the evaluation year. In addition, tenure-track faculty should arrange for a peer observation of their teaching performance each year and submit that observation report with their other materials during the years of a Portfolio Performance Review.

The review processes for tenure-track faculty in their third year and sixth year, along with those undergoing post-tenure review, are more extensive and are detailed in the section below titled Tenured and Tenure-Track Portfolio Performance Review—Third Year, Sixth Year, and Post-Tenure Review Years. Faculty members during these years will develop an electronic Faculty Portfolio of professional evidence to be presented to reviewers at the time of the annual review. Guidelines for the Faculty Portfolio are outlined in the Appendix.

Full-Time Faculty Annual Review Process in years other than Third Year, Sixth Year, and Post-Tenure Review Years

1. Faculty members (other than Department Chairs) will provide an Annual Self-Evaluation, a current Professional Activities Summary (PAS), a current curriculum vitae (CV), and student course evaluations for the evaluation year to their Department Chair. Persons in tenure-track appointments should have a yearly peer observation of their teaching performance as well, but would not need to submit them until the years designated for a Portfolio Performance Review.
2. The Department Chair will review all materials, including any supplemental materials the department requests, and will write an evaluation letter summarizing their findings and recommendations.
    a. In the event of a positive annual evaluation, the review process stops with the chair's evaluation, and the chair will provide a copy of the evaluation letter to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Provost's Office for the faculty member's file.

   b. In the event of a negative annual evaluation, the process will proceed to the next step.
3. The Department Chair will forward all materials, including the chair's letter, to the Dean of the College.
4. The Dean of the College will review all materials and recommendations and advise the faculty member and the Provost of the result of the evaluation.
5. The Dean of the College is responsible for annually reviewing Department Chairs using procedures similar to the ones above, with negative evaluations escalating to the Provost.

At each step in the review process, the reviewer's recommendation will be sent to the person at the next level of review and to the faculty member. The faculty member will be provided an opportunity to add a written response at each step for consideration by the next level reviewer. No material may be added to, or taken away from, the body of materials, with the exception of these additional written statements from the faculty member being reviewed.

Section 6. TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE REVIEW—THIRD YEAR, SIXTH YEAR, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW YEARS

Tenure-Track (Probationary) Faculty Third Year Review
A third-year review process is essential to evaluate the performance of the tenure-track faculty member in their progress toward tenure. This intensive review should demonstrate the faculty member's achievements and plan for improving in teaching, scholarship, and service. By conducting the third-year review, the faculty member will have adequate time to address any recommended corrective actions and/or recommendations to improve teaching, scholarly activities, and service.

For this review, the tenure-track faculty member will submit a full Faculty Portfolio to the College Personnel Committee instead of the normal yearly review materials. Guidelines for the Faculty Portfolio are outlined in the Appendix.

Tenure-Track (Probationary) Faculty Critical Sixth-Year Review
The critical sixth-year review process is essential to evaluate the performance of the tenure-track faculty member in order to determine whether tenure should be awarded. This intensive review should demonstrate the faculty member's achievement to date in teaching, scholarship, and service.

For this review, the tenure-track faculty member will submit a full Faculty Portfolio to the College Personnel Committee instead of the normal yearly review materials. Guidelines for the Faculty Portfolio are outlined in the Appendix.

Post-Tenure Review
Tenured faculty shall complete a post-tenure review process each six years beginning six years from the awarding of tenure.

The post-tenure review will include an extensive review of teaching, scholarship, and University and professional service. The most critical aspect for tenured faculty at the University is teaching, which should be well-documented. Results of the post-tenure review may be combined with a bid for promotion.

For this review, the tenured faculty member will submit a full Faculty Portfolio to the College Personnel Committee instead of the normal yearly review materials. Guidelines for the Faculty Portfolio are outlined in the Appendix.

Full-Time Faculty Review Process During the Third Year, Sixth Year, and Post-Tenure Review Years

1. Faculty members will provide a completed, full Faculty Portfolio to the College Personnel Committee by the date specified by the Dean of the College and the Provost.
2. The College Personnel Committee will review the Faculty Portfolio, including any supplemental materials set forth by the department, and peer observations. After that review, the College Personnel Committee will forward these materials, along with their written evaluation, to the Department Chair.
3. The Department Chair will review and then forward these materials, the letter from the College Personnel Committee, along with the Department Chair's own evaluation, to the Dean of the College and the Provost.
4. The Deans of the Colleges, the Associate Provost, and the Provost will together comprise the Administrative Review Team, which will then review all materials, along with the chair's letter, and write an evaluation letter summarizing the review findings.
5. The Administrative Review Team will then forward all materials and recommendations to the President and advise the faculty member of the result of the evaluation.

At each step in the review process, the reviewer's recommendation will be sent to the person at the next level of review and to the faculty member. The faculty member will be provided an opportunity to add a written response at each step for consideration by the next level reviewer. No material may be added to, or taken away from, the body of materials, with the exception of these additional written statements from the faculty member being reviewed.

Section 7. NON-TENURE-TRACK AND TERM FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Term Faculty Review

Full-time non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., faculty who are not tenured, on a tenure-track, term, or in a librarian track) are typically employed in the rank of instructor or lecturer, with a term or regular faculty appointment.

Term faculty are contingent, full-time or part-time, non-tenure-track faculty hired for a specific period of time, whether for a semester or an academic year. While a full-time faculty member is eligible to receive reappointment to additional terms, no single term may exceed three years. No number of term appointments shall create any presumption of a right to appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty.

Non-tenure-track and term faculty will be evaluated primarily with respect to their excellence in teaching.

The non-tenure-track or term faculty member is expected to be involved in light to modest levels of service and scholarship unless there are specified scholarship and/or service requirements of the appointment.

The annual faculty review process will focus on teaching performance, unless the appointment specifies otherwise, and the faculty member should arrange for a peer observation of their teaching performance each year.

Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track and Term Faculty Review Process

1. Faculty members will provide an Annual Self-Evaluation, a current Professional Activities Summary (PAS), a current curriculum vitae (CV), student course evaluations for the evaluation year, and a peer observation of their teaching performance to their Department Chair.
2. The Department Chair will review all materials, including any supplemental materials the department requests, and will write an evaluation letter summarizing their findings and recommendations.
    a. In the event of a positive annual evaluation, the review process stops with the chair's evaluation, and a copy of the evaluation letter is to be provided to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Provost's Office for the faculty member's file.
    b. In the event of a negative annual evaluation, the process will proceed to the next step.
3. The Department Chair will forward all materials, including the chair's recommendation, to the Dean of the College.
4. The Dean of the College will review all materials and recommendations and advise the faculty member and the Provost of the result of the evaluation.

At each step in the review process, the reviewer's recommendation will be sent to the person at the next level of review and to the faculty member. The faculty member will be provided an opportunity to add a written response at each step for consideration by the next level reviewer. No material may be added to, or taken away from, the body of materials, with the exception of these additional written statements from the faculty member being reviewed.

Section 8. RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The Department Chair, college Dean, and Provost have primary responsibility for assuring the ongoing and periodic assessments of faculty performance outcomes and behaviors are completed and that such outcomes meet University expectations.

All participants are responsible for meeting timetables as established by the Provost's Office and the college Deans.

Section 9. AUTHORITY FOR INTERPRETATION

The final authority for interpretation of this policy rests with the President and Provost.

Section 10. AMENDMENTS

This Policy may be amended to change names, links to information, and contact information without resorting to the rulemaking process.

Federal and State laws, rules, and regulations change. Any portion of this policy may be modified in practice to ensure the due process rights of the individuals involved are protected and to conform with any current Federal and State law, rules, and regulations. Subject to the institution's rulemaking policy, the institution will change this policy to conform to the most current laws and regulations within a reasonable time of discovering the change.

Section 11. REFERENCE
Amends and replaces BOG Policy CU-AA-64, Faculty Evaluation and Performance Review, effective June 4, 2024.

APPROVAL
Intent to Plan Approved by the CU Board of Governors: June 4, 2024
Approval by the Board of Governors: October 17, 2024

APPENDIX
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY PORTFOLIO

The Faculty Portfolio
The portfolio is a compilation of materials that allows tenure-track (probationary) faculty, faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure, or tenured faculty undergoing a post-tenure review to document their work in a variety of ways. The portfolio is used to demonstrate fulfillment of performance expectations.

Contents
The electronic portfolio should be clearly organized into the following sections:

1. Self-evaluation (limited to six pages) – a reflection of the evaluation period of the faculty member's teaching, professional development, and service
2. Professional Activities Summary (PAS). Include all years since last review for tenure-track and tenured faculty
3. Current CV
4. Peer teaching evaluations by a member of the College Personnel Committee, faculty in department, and/or Department Chair.
5. Supervisory / personnel evaluations on same schedule as PAS
6. Student evaluations for each class for all the years since previous review requiring a faculty portfolio.
7. Evidence of teaching effectiveness (examples offered below)
8. Evidence of scholarly and/or creative activities (examples offered below)
9. Evidence of service (examples offered below)

The judicious inclusion of materials dated prior to the most recent year of service is acceptable, but the portfolio should focus on providing data relevant to academic accomplishments in the years since the last review.

Sections 6 through 8 of the Portfolio provide faculty an opportunity to define their teaching, scholarship, and service by choosing representative artifacts to incorporate into the portfolio.

> Examples of evidence for good teaching include student course evaluations; peer observations; evidence of the development of pedagogical innovations or innovations to course or lab materials; participation in workshops or conferences designed to enhance teaching skills; evidence of successful mentoring of undergraduate or graduate research; evidence of good advising and mentoring of students, generally; or other evidence of good teaching, including future development plans.
>
> Examples of evidence for scholarly and creative activities might include copies of publications; records of presentations, performances, or exhibits; excerpts from successful grant proposals; scholarly awards; statement of research philosophy; description of current research; or other evidence of scholarship, including future development plans.

Examples of evidence for service might include contributions to program or institutional assessment; grants received to develop and promote service activities; written acknowledgements of professional or campus service; meritorious service awards; or other evidence of service, including future development plans.

Criteria for Teaching, Scholarship and Service

Teaching (65%)

- Peer review of teaching and advising, including classroom observation, review of syllabus, review of LMS course activity, etc.
- Student perceptions of teaching through student courses evaluations.
- Engaging in activities to enhance teaching effectiveness demonstrated through examples such as participation in pedagogical workshops or conferences; development of innovative teaching techniques, activities, or materials; or mentoring undergraduate or graduate research.

Scholarship (Between 10% and 20%):

- Staying current in one's field, demonstrated through such activities as ongoing reading of scholarship and monitoring trends, maintaining membership, and being active in a professional organization, or attending conference or professional workshops.
- Engaging in scholarly activity or producing scholarly work, demonstrated through such activities as conducting original research, presenting at a professional conference, publishing material in a scholarly journal, publishing or editing a scholarly text, exhibiting or performing artistically or publishing a creative work, engaging in continuing education, producing reports or other documents for accreditation purposes, or submitting grant proposals, manuscripts, or professional reports.

University and Professional Service (Between 15% and 25%):

- Participation in University, college, or departmental committees, demonstrated through statements from committee colleagues or chairs.
- Engaging in other service to the University, including such activities as participating in admissions, orientations, or recruiting events, contributing to program or institutional assessment or accreditation efforts, supervising labs or other facilities, or sponsoring or advising student organizations.
- Engaging in professional service to the larger community, including such activities as participating in professional societies and organizations, engaging in educational outreach to the larger community, serving on boards or other community organizations or committees, serving as a consultant or resource liaison for community organizations or businesses.