

GUIDELINES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF FACULTY

A regular review of faculty can improve the quality of the teaching, research, and service functions of the University. In addition, it will benefit individual faculty members by assuring that they are regularly informed of their status. Such a review shall include input from colleagues and students from the faculty member's own administrative unit as well as from other appropriate units. The written summary of the review shall be provided to the faculty member, **and** the faculty member shall have ample opportunity to add written rebuttals or explanations.

Administrative faculty shall also be reviewed in terms of their administrative function (*See Guidelines for Review of Academic Administration*).

Frequency of Review

Best practice is to review all faculty every year. The procedure for the actual review is best developed by the individual school, college, or division. Nevertheless, certain guidelines are appropriate for the University as a whole. All faculty with an FTE of 0.5 or more shall be reviewed as follows:

Faculty with annual tenure shall be reviewed annually.

Faculty with indefinite tenure shall be reviewed as follows:

- Assistant and Associate Professors shall be reviewed annually during their **second through fifth years in rank** at OSU and during any period in which they are reviewed intensively for promotion in rank. Otherwise, they shall be reviewed at least once every three years.
- Professors and tenured Senior Instructors I and Senior Instructors II shall be reviewed at least **once every three years**.

Faculty with fixed-term Senior Research, Clinical or Practice professorial appointments shall be reviewed as described for faculty with indefinite tenure.

Other faculty on fixed-term appointments (Instructors, Faculty Research Assistants, Senior Faculty Research Assistants I, Senior Faculty Research Assistants II, untenured Senior Instructors I, Senior Instructors II, and Research Associates) shall be reviewed as follows:

- annually during their first five years of service;
- during any period in which they are being reviewed intensively for promotion in rank; and
- at least once every three years thereafter.

Professional Faculty shall be reviewed annually.

Faculty on multi-year or extended fixed-term appointments shall be reviewed annually.

Periodic review is NOT required for the following faculty members on fixed-term appointments:

- emeritus appointments;
- temporary postdoctoral appointments; and
- visiting appointments for two years or less.

Any faculty member eligible for review is entitled to a review at any time, upon the faculty member's request.

Each college, department, or division shall annually report to their Business Center Human Resources Manager which members of its faculty were reviewed.

Nature of the Evaluation

In each instance, the evaluation shall include:

- a statement of current responsibilities of the faculty member (i.e. position description); and
- signed comments on the faculty member's progress in teaching, research or other scholarly pursuits, extension, librarianship, professionally related service, and University service from those persons designated by the department, school, or University to make the evaluations.

The sources of information used as the basis for the evaluation should be included. Sources to be used are current and former students, other faculty from this University or other universities, professional colleagues and, if appropriate, the public. In all instances, the evaluation shall be based only on material that is appropriate to the faculty member's profession and the performance of faculty assignments.

The faculty member must be provided the opportunity of reading and initialing the evaluation and of furnishing written comments, explanations, or a rebuttal to the evaluations to be placed in the faculty member's personnel records file. Disagreements on file contents should be handled through normal University appeal procedures.

Initiation and Disposition

The initiation of the review, except one requested by a faculty member, is the responsibility of the department head, chair, or appropriate administrative officer. Principal investigators are reminded that all faculty on their projects, including Faculty Research Assistants, should be reviewed following the guidelines outlined above.

The review and all related materials are to be placed in the faculty member's personnel records file that is maintained by the department.

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

It is the policy of Oregon State University that those responsible for supervising academic administrators shall provide continuous personnel counsel on each administrator's effectiveness, making specific suggestions when improvement is needed. Evaluation should also be one element of the supervisor's annual program/budget review and planning session with the unit administrator. In addition, the supervisor shall conduct a formal periodic performance evaluation of each administrator at intervals not to exceed five years.

Before the formal periodic performance evaluation begins, each administrator should decide whether to waive the right to review solicited input (a sample Waiver of Access agreement can be found at <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/hr/document/pdf/waiver-access>). The administrator should be reminded that signing the waiver is totally voluntary. Those being asked to provide input should be told whether the administrator has or has not waived his or her right to access the input.

No standard procedure for periodic performance evaluations will fit all cases as administrative positions vary in scope and complexity. However, each periodic performance evaluation will be conducted personally by the administrator's supervisor and will provide opportunities, as appropriate, for substantive input from:

- faculty, staff, and students within the unit;
- groups inside and outside the University that are significantly affected by the administrator's performance; and
- others in a position to observe and evaluate the incumbent's performance effectively.

Continuation of the incumbent's administrative appointment following the periodic performance evaluation requires a letter from the supervisor formalizing the action to continue the appointment.

This policy does not affect the term, if any, of an administrative appointment.

Presented to the Faculty Senate for approval on January 8, 2008. Approved and adopted by President Ray on July 25, 2008.

POLICY FOR MID-TERM REVIEWS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

In addition to the annual Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF), all academic units will conduct mid-term intensive reviews for faculty on annual tenure-track appointments. The primary intent is to review progress toward indefinite tenure so that timely guidance can be extended to the faculty member.

Mid-term reviews are supplemental to annual PROF evaluations and to a subsequent formal promotion and/or tenure evaluation. The mid-term review provides opportunity for the Department faculty, Department Head, Dean and other supervisors to observe and comment upon an individual faculty member's performance relative to University and College promotion and tenure guidelines, and to offer appropriate advice and counsel on improving performance to meet promotion and tenure requirements. It also provides a forum for the faculty member being reviewed to ask questions about the process and criteria for granting indefinite tenure or promotion. This policy does not alter the probationary status of a tenure track appointment and the University's rights to issue a letter of timely notice under State Board of Higher Education Rules, OAR 580-021-0110.

The following general University guidelines are to be used in conducting mid-term tenure reviews:

- A. Mid-term reviews will usually be conducted during the final quarter of the third year of the initial appointment. For faculty whose probationary service has been either shortened for prior service or lengthened for extenuating circumstances, the review should be done during the year which best equates with the mid point in the faculty member's probationary service.
- B. In general, the mid-term review is to be used as a supplement to, and not as a replacement for, the annual review in the year it is given. Exceptions to this statement are possible if the mid-term review contains all the components of a regular annual review. If it does not, an annual PROF review must be done in addition to the mid-term review.
- C. Colleges and/or departments must apply the process uniformly to all members of the faculty on annual tenure-track appointments.
- D. All materials used in the review must be open to review by the faculty member; including any external letters of evaluation that might be solicited (unless a waiver of access has been signed).
- E. The outcome of the mid-term review must be shared with the faculty member for comment and signature, and included in the individual's personnel file.
- F. Colleges and Departments may write additional guidelines in order to provide extra detail on process, or that are specific to their personnel or mission. All such unit specific guidelines must be consistent with the university guidelines and must be submitted to the Provost for review and approval prior to implementation. As with any set of guidelines, units are responsible for informing their faculty of any additional guidelines they have created.
- G. The guidelines for mid-term reviews should not preclude the University in issuing letters of timely notice in any of the years prior to a tenure decision; nor should they limit the purpose or intent of the annual review.