

UNIVERSITY POLICY FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Policy No. UPAA-22 ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1 General Information:

- 1.1 Scope: Academic policy regarding the annual evaluation of faculty -- the implementation application and internal procedures for market equity, merit processes, and planning.
- 1.2 Authority: W. Va. Code §18B-1-6
- 1.3 Passage Date: April 29, 2021
- 1.4 Effective Date: June 8 , 2021
- 1.5 Controlling over: Marshall University
- 1.6 History: This section has been revised by the Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Committee as a result of changes to Series 9 dated January 10, 2004. (SR-04-05-(12) 69 FECAHC) Original date of passage and effective date was March 8, 2006. Amended on April 23, 2014 (upon passage of amended policy). Amended for a second time at the April 29, 2021 meeting of the Marshall University Board of Governor. This rule was updated (recategorization of polices and rules) by the Marshall Board of Governors on December 13, 2023.

Commented [CB1]: Added updated history

2 Policy:

- 2.1 Faculty members will be evaluated according to the criteria established under AA-21 Faculty Workload, and related Department, College, or School policies and guidelines.
- 2.2 The evaluation calendar will run from January to December in order to compress the time between evaluation and awarding of promotion and tenure. Steps in the evaluation process are as follows:
 - 2.2.1 By the deadlines established by Academic Affairs, faculty will enter their activities from the previous calendar year into Digital Measures and upload necessary supporting documents.
 - 2.2.2 By the deadlines established by Academic Affairs, faculty will evaluate their work in the previous calendar year in each of their workload areas. They will create a planning page (or planned activities) detailing their planned activities for the next review cycle, faculty if needed may renegotiate their planning page (or planned activities) with their direct supervisor and Dean if necessary.
 - 2.2.3 The direct supervisor will review the annual evaluation of each faculty member and provide an evaluation of the work of the faculty member in each workload area. The direct supervisor may add their own narrative feedback, if necessary.

Commented [CB2]: This did not exist before but is important to other policies.

- 2.2.4 The direct supervisor will complete the retention letter for probationary faculty or the renewal letter for term faculty, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member in each workload area. Peer review may also be included in the process if the college deems it necessary or desirable.
- 2.2.5 The direct supervisor will communicate with faculty to discuss their annual evaluation. If necessary, the faculty member and direct supervisor will work together to develop an improvement plan.
- 2.2.6 The dean of the faculty member's college or school will review the annual evaluation of each faculty member and may provide an evaluation of the work of the faculty member in each workload area. The dean may add their own narrative feedback, if necessary.
- 2.2.7 When necessary, the dean will meet with faculty to discuss their annual evaluations.
- 2.2.8 The completed faculty evaluations will be submitted to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) for review.

3 Appeals:

- 3.1 In the event a faculty member and the direct supervisor are unable to agree upon the annual evaluation, the faculty member may appeal to the dean, and then appeal, if necessary, to the CAO. A notice of the disagreement would go in the faculty file, and then the evaluation would or would not be amended when the dean's or CAO's decision is made.

4 Evaluation:

- 4.1 Faculty members are evaluated according to the workload agreed upon under UPAA-20.
- 4.2 The results of evaluation must be expressed using the labels and corresponding definitions below.
 - 4.2.1 Exemplary
 - 4.2.1.1 This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the institution, making significant contributions to their department, college, academic field, and society.

Commented [CB3]: Reflection number policy numbers

4.2.2 Professional

4.2.2.1 This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance. The individuals receiving this rating constitute those good and valued professionals on whom the continued successful achievement of the institution's mission, goals and objectives depends.

4.2.3 Needs improvement

4.2.3.1 This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not consistently meet the institution's standards of professional performance. This rating must be given with

1) specific feedback as to which standards of professional performance were not met, 2) suggestions for improvement, and 3) a written commitment to assist the individual in accessing resources required for improvement. Improvement in performance is required within the next evaluation period provided suggestions for improvement were made and necessary resources for improvements were provided.

4.2.4 Unacceptable

4.2.4.1 This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not meet the institution's standards of professional performance. This rating represents performance that is not acceptable and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any one of the three following ways will result in a rating of "Unacceptable."

- Received a needs improvement rating the previous rating period but did not make the improvements required.
- Consistently violated one or more of the institution's standards of professional performance.
- Violated one or more of the standards of conduct as specified in the faculty handbook.
- Violated has been found guilty of violating professional ethics / responsibility or research ethics and integrity.

5. Planning Pages or Planned Activities:

As discussed in 2.2.2 of this rule, each faculty member will develop a planning page (or list of planned activities) detailing their planned activities for the next review cycle. In conjunction with their immediate supervisor and Dean, faculty may, negotiate their planning pages should a change in circumstances occur.

Commented [CB4]: Added the ability to revise planning pages.

6. Review:

To ensure that the objectives of this policy are being met, each department/division and college/school will conduct reviews of its annual evaluation policies and procedures at least once every three years. Modifications to improve the policy's accuracy, clarity, usefulness, and other factors found relevant, should be instituted. The Faculty Senate's Faculty Personnel Committee will conduct a review of this policy at least once each five years and recommend any changes it deems necessary to ensure that the objectives of this policy are being met. To ensure that these reviews are conducted, the Office of Academic Affairs will establish a review schedule and, according to the schedule, remind each department/division and college/school to review its annual evaluation policies and procedures. The Faculty Senate will establish a review schedule and, according to the schedule, remind the Faculty Personnel Committee to review the policy.