



## **College of Information Sciences and Technology AC-40 Evaluation of Faculty Performance Administrative Guidelines**

### **PURPOSE**

To provide a process for the annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty and for periodic extended review.

### **RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCTING REVIEW**

Responsibility for faculty performance evaluation reviews rests with the Dean. The evaluation process is coordinated by the Dean's office with input from the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The P&T committee will constitute the Extended Review Committee. The faculty member may nominate two Penn State faculty members external to the College to serve on the committee from which the Dean shall select one. The selected person will be a member of the Extended Review Committee.

### **RATIONALE FOR REVIEW**

Critical review is a natural element of a productive academic career. A faculty member's work is reviewed regularly in many different ways. Teaching is evaluated by peers and students; proposals for funding are evaluated by individual reviewers or panels of specialists; papers and books submitted for publication are reviewed by authorities in the field; published books are reviewed by other scholars; a faculty member's contributions in teaching, research and scholarship, and service are carefully scrutinized when the individual is considered for hiring or promotion.

In addition, the annual performance review is not only necessary for the process of determining merit salary increases; it also provides an occasion for self-evaluation and reassessment of the role a faculty is playing, which may evolve significantly during the course of a career. It is an opportunity to acknowledge and recognize good work, point out areas for improvement, and, in a few cases, identify productive new uses of a faculty member's talents. It is a means of ensuring that the diverse talents of the entire faculty are productively applied to the many responsibilities of the University. In addition, performance reviews can help identify resource targets—places where additional resources could re-energize a faculty member whose energy or morale has run low or could lift an already productive member to new levels of achievement.

## **ANNUAL REVIEW**

Each annual review should include the faculty member's written annual report (Faculty Activity Report) that includes evidence of teaching effectiveness, and may involve thorough one-on-one discussions with the Dean of the faculty member's teaching, research, service, future plans, assignments, and salary.

The evaluations are made by using elements listed in AC 21, Definitions of Academic Rank, and AC 23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations, and are conducted in accordance with procedures developed herein. Each faculty member's evaluation is related to his or her area of assignment and responsibility, with maximum weight given to the area of major emphasis in the individual's assignment. The Dean will provide written documentation to the faculty member of the results of these reviews with copies of that feedback to the dean. Finally, the Dean must articulate a clear link between the performance review and the faculty rewards.

## **EXTENDED REVIEW**

To be most effective, the annual review must periodically not only deal with the previous year's performance, but also take a longer-range view. This extended review will take place every 5 years since the last promotion or AC40 review.

The content of the extended review should not only have an historic element (i.e., be based on the previous four Faculty Activity Reviews and the previous extended review if applicable) but also contain a statement of the faculty member's professional and academic goals for the next five year period. As the basis for the review process, the faculty member will submit a narrative statement, a curriculum vitae, and other documentation of performance not covered by the CV. The narrative statement should outline the faculty member's goals for professional development and describe past accomplishments and future objectives specific to those goals. The narrative may also describe additional accomplishments not apparent in the CV. The narrative will not exceed three pages in length. These items—narrative statement, CV, performance documentation—and copies of the past annual review letters for the evaluation period comprise the evaluation materials. A summary statement of the previous 5 year period is also welcomed.

In the event that improvements in performance and/or the redirection of contribution to the department are necessary, the faculty member and the Dean should work on an appropriate response plan, the implementation of which should be monitored by the Dean. A copy of the feedback and the response plan should go to the Dean.

## **ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES**

Promotion reviews would not constitute an extended review but can be substituted for an annual review. Faculty members who have provided written notice of retirement one year in advance would be excluded from an extended review if the scheduled review fell within that year. External letters will neither be solicited nor considered as part of the extended review. The Dean will have the discretion to delay the extended review process due to unforeseen circumstances such as extended sick leave. However, sabbaticals and academic leaves (with or without pay) should be included in determining the review schedule.

rev 2/13/03

rev 6/13/07

JY/mmr

rev 27apr11 FER/ms

rev 11/13/18 dmd