

## **Faculty Performance Review and Evaluation Policy FP103**

Approvals: Faculty Senate, President, Board of Trustees  
Effective: September 19, 2017

### **Performance Review Philosophy Statement**

National Louis University values the interrelated faculty roles of teaching excellence, service to the profession, service to the institution, and scholarship. (For a detailed explanation of these domains, see Appendix 1, National Louis University Policy on Workload, FP120).

Teaching (or "instruction") shall include the planning, development, facilitation, implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of experiences, activities, or resources that foster learning for NLU students and clients.

Service to the profession shall include participation and leadership in demonstrably relevant professional organizations, participation in emerging scholarly or professional organizations which cross traditional boundaries, and public service which is sponsored by or contributes to the development of the profession.

Service to the institution shall include a wide range of activities which support specific programs, academic units, faculty governance, and/or institutional advancement. Specific roles include those which are generally expected of all faculty (e.g., academic advising, meetings, and promotional activities) and others which are entered into through the faculty governance system or by administrative appointment.

Scholarship shall be broadly interpreted as including the discovery, integration, application, criticism, and communication of knowledge as recognized within and across the domains of traditional and emerging academic disciplines and professions.

The degree to which any one faculty role is emphasized in an academic year depends on the mission and purposes of NLU, the academic unit, the faculty member's current assignment, and the professional development goals jointly developed by the faculty member and dean in the annual work plan. Generally, the faculty member's role will comprise each of the domains as required by faculty status, role, and responsibilities.

Performance evaluations are not designed or intended to review or remove tenure status, nor are they designed to or intended to interfere with or diminish the academic freedom of any faculty member.

### **Purpose of Faculty Evaluation**

An effective faculty evaluation system evaluates the interrelated faculty roles of teaching, service to the profession, service to the institution, and scholarship through a combination of both summative and formative evaluations. Evaluations should be performed in a timely manner and should be conducted through discussion between the faculty member and the dean or dean's designee. The University collectively benefits from the individual faculty member's achievement and development. Individual faculty members benefit from the definition of performance criteria, implementation of an equitable process, and adherence to reasonable time lines. The process itself is collaborative and ongoing.

Formative evaluations are intended to provide a systematic process for assisting faculty in balancing individual and institutional goals and for promoting professional growth and development. They primarily benefit the individual faculty member by providing reasonable support for continual growth and development in teaching excellence; service to the profession, professional development and engagement; service to the institution; and research, scholarship and inquiry.

As part of this process, faculty set goals each year that align with their work plan and incorporate long term goals for continual improvement.

Summative evaluations are intended to provide a rational and fair evaluation of the faculty members in meeting their annual performance expectations and goals on a yearly basis. In addition, they lay the foundation for setting of the subsequent year's workload and goals and addressing any areas that need improvement. The summative component is also used to help inform determinations for faculty merit salary increases and future renewal decisions.

Evaluations are an integral component of the tenure and/or promotion review process. The yearly performance reviews are expected to form the basis for faculty's dossiers in the tenure and promotion process.

Satisfactory performance reviews and annual continuation of appointments are no guarantee that tenure and/or promotion will be awarded. These performance reviews are to be considered confidential and are maintained by the Provost Office. They are unavailable beyond NLU without the written permission of the individual faculty member.

---

### **Faculty Performance Review and Evaluation Procedures**

The Provost has oversight of the performance evaluation process, whereas the dean of each college is responsible for the evaluation of faculty performance. The dean or his/her designee conducts performance reviews according to procedures specified by the University.

### **Faculty Self-Evaluation and Goal Setting**

All full-time faculty are reviewed on an annual basis and will be evaluated on the established criteria that will be disseminated each year. All full-time faculty will submit a self-evaluation that includes a narrative and supporting documentation that demonstrates what they have accomplished during the year. The self-evaluation includes demonstration of work in each of the areas (teaching excellence; professional development and engagement; service to the institution; and research, scholarship and inquiry) where workload has been assigned. This self-evaluation consists of two parts: (1) a self-reflective narrative describing the progress on the goals set for the academic year and (2) documentation supporting the narrative.

Faculty members are responsible for clearly explaining their progress toward their goals and providing relevant evidence that supports their progress. In a sense, they are making a case about their progress on the established criteria and achievement of their goals. The self-reflection should be clear, concise, and easy to read, and supporting documentation should be referenced.

The evidence considered in the evaluation process will include the following:

#### **A. Faculty Self-evaluation Form**

The completed form contains:

- (a) a brief recap of current year's load and goals in each domain (current year goals section on the form);
- (b) narrative describing progress on the goals over the last year and addressing any reasons why goals were not met in each domain; and
- (c) a reflection on any summarized student feedback data (e.g., data from the NLU course evaluation system, data from the college, department, program, or faculty created student surveys) they have received and how those have impacted teaching practices and plans for future development.

## **National Louis University – FP103**

When the anchor statements reference “rank, position, and workload expectations,” faculty should compare themselves to the expectations for their current rank and tenure status in FP 104 (“Promotion and Tenure”).

B. Current curriculum vitae

C. Course evaluations for the review period

D. Support documentation in electronic format (refer to the performance evaluation rubrics, FP 120, and FP 104 for relevant examples)

E. Data from other sources relevant to performance may be included by the deans, Provost Office, or Human Resources.

To have a fair and equitable review, it is the responsibility of the faculty to build an adequate and evidentiary case for review

For discussion during their performance review, faculty submit draft goals for the following year. The college’s strategic priorities and annual program review feedback should be used to inform faculty goal setting. Following the review, faculty finalize their goals and submit them along with their workload plan. The deans or designees review and approve these for the next academic year.

### **Faculty Evaluation Review Meeting**

Faculty are reviewed by the dean or dean's designee. In most cases, reviewers are assigned based upon their knowledge of the work of the faculty member being reviewed. If a faculty member believes there are specific circumstances that warrant the selection of a different reviewer, she/he may request that a substitution be made. The decision of the dean and the Provost in these cases is final.

The dean or designee in conducting the performance review develops a draft supervisor evaluation based on the narrative and documentation provided by faculty prior to the review meeting. The dean or designee is responsible for providing the faculty member with the draft supervisor evaluation prior to their meeting. The meeting itself is collaborative. The dean or designee and the faculty member discuss the faculty member’s self-evaluation, goals, and plans for long-term development, and the draft supervisor evaluation. Changes are made to the draft evaluation based on the discussion and any additional evidence provided. A final supervisor evaluation is signed by both parties. The results of these reviews are summarized and records are kept by the Provost’s Office.

A faculty member’s signature on the supervisor evaluation form does not imply agreement or admission to any portion of this document. It serves only to confirm delivery of the document to the employee. The faculty member may submit corrections of fact and/or written rebuttal to any portion of the final supervisor evaluation form to Human Resources within 10 business days upon receipt. The comments and/or corrections of fact to should be recorded on a separate document with the title “Comments and/or Corrections to Performance Review for (faculty name)”. Additionally, indicate “elements of the review are disputed” after the signature line on the final supervisor evaluation form. Perceived deviation from due process may be appealed to the Faculty Development and Welfare Committee but subjective performance evaluations and decisions may not. These concerns are submitted as part of the rebuttal process to Human Resources. Upon receipt of a correction of fact or rebuttal from Human Resources, the Provost Office will attach the document to the supervisor evaluation.

Upon completion of each year’s performance process, an evaluation of the process by the Provost’s Office occurs to ensure continual improvement. The designated Senate Committee shall regularly review the faculty evaluation policy and procedures to ensure it is current and appropriate.

## **National Louis University – FP103**

For performance reviews to be effective, it is important that deans or their designees have ongoing conversations with faculty members regarding their growth, development, and performance throughout the academic year. Faculty will continue to review their goals in light of any changes that have occurred and revise them accordingly in consultation with their dean or designee. If subsequent changes occur in faculty members' workload, they initiate a conversation with their dean or designee to further revise their goals.

### **Training and Preparation**

Acknowledging that performance reviews are important for faculty growth and development, the tenure and promotion evaluation process, and informing merit increases, training of faculty in how to put together a solid, convincing self-evaluation with documentation representative of their work is provided on an annual basis.

Recognizing that reviewers may change every year, continual training of reviewers is critical. An annual training of reviewers is conducted by the Provost Office and anyone designated to review must attend the training.

This training is two-fold: training on how to conduct performance reviews in a consultative manner; and training on how to apply the criteria in consistent and equitable way.

### **Timeline**

The general timeline and sequence is listed below. This may change based on continuous process improvement or other factors.

**October** - Provost Office and designated Senate Committee will review evaluation feedback and recommend changes to the faculty performance evaluation process and criteria, as needed.

**November** – Provost Office will announce timeline for faculty performance reviews and trainings.

**January/February**– The forms and rubrics will be disseminated by the Provost Office. Trainings will be held for faculty and reviewers.

**January through April** - Faculty will complete self-evaluation, upload evidence documents (at least 2 weeks in advance of review meeting or due date). Goals are drafted for the following year and uploaded with the self-evaluation documents.

**February/March** - The list of reviewers and assigned faculty will be disseminated by the colleges.

**March** - Review dates and times open to faculty to set up their review meetings, as needed..

**By March 1st** – Non-tenure/tenure-track and non-tenure/ non-tenure track faculty will be notified regarding reappointment for the following year.

**April - May** – Supervisors will review faculty self-evaluations and evidence documents. Supervisor evaluations will be drafted and uploaded 48 hours in advance of the review meeting or by established date

**April - May** – Prior to the review meeting, faculty will read through the draft supervisor evaluation provided and prepare questions and/or areas for discussion.

**April - May** - Review meetings and/or written feedback takes place. Finalized Supervisor Evaluation Forms are made available to faculty members.

**June 15th** – Faculty finalize draft goals for the following year and submit to their supervisor.

**By June 30th** – Based on supervisor feedback, faculty finalize their goals and submit to the College.

**By June 30th** - Letters of Appointment issued to all full-time faculty for the next academic year.