

### **III.D.7. Annual Review of Faculty**

Tenure-track, career-track, and short-term faculty (see I.B.4 for community faculty exception) eligible for rehire at the end of their contracts must be included in the formal annual review process; this includes adjunct and adjoint faculty with FTE greater than zero. Faculty planning to leave the university before the next academic year may forgo the annual review.

Faculty performance will be reviewed annually through one of the following three (3) procedures:

- (a) An abridged review.
- (b) A comprehensive review.
- (c) An intensive review.

Annual reviews give faculty the opportunity to highlight, reflect on, and obtain feedback about their accomplishments over the past calendar year and how this work enhances their overall career. Annual reviews are to provide the following information as appropriate:

- (a) An appraisal of each pre-tenured faculty member's progress toward tenure.
- (b) An appraisal of each faculty member's progress towards promotion, if the faculty member is eligible for promotion.
- (c) A rating of each faculty member's annual (or biennial) performance in the context of their cumulative work.

Faculty who have served at Washington State University for less than one (1) year need not be reviewed except for pre-tenure faculty, who must have a record of review from the start of their appointment.

Throughout the following section, the word "chair" is used to represent a department chair, school director, or program director, and the word "department" is used to represent a department, school, or program.

Reviews will be differentiated by tenure status as follows:

- (a) Pre-tenured faculty usually undergo one intensive review with the remainder of the reviews being comprehensive. An intensive review is normally required during the third full year of appointment. For faculty appointments with pre-tenure periods less than six (6) years, the time of the intensive review will be negotiated at the time of appointment. For faculty appointments with pre-tenure periods less than three (3) years, the intensive review is optional.
- (b) All other faculty normally undergo comprehensive and abridged reviews in alternate years.

Faculty eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to request an intensive review, in lieu of a comprehensive or abridged review, every four (4) to six (6) years to help prepare materials for promotion. Notice of the request to undergo an intensive review by the faculty member must be communicated by the due date set by the chair. It is within the authority of the chair or dean to recommend an intensive review, but it is the faculty member's purview to choose between an intensive or comprehensive review.

If a faculty member receives an annual review rating of less than satisfactory, all subsequent annual reviews will be comprehensive or intensive until a rating of satisfactory or better is achieved.

In the years in which a faculty member is due an abridged review, it is the prerogative of the faculty member or the chair, in consultation with the dean, academic director, or other supervisor, to elect a comprehensive review as warranted.

### *Abridged Review*

**Purpose and Criteria** Abridged reviews are intended for all faculty, except pre-tenure faculty, who continue to perform at or above expectations. Normally, abridged reviews occur the year following a year in which the faculty member received an annual review rating of satisfactory or above on a comprehensive or intensive review.

**Submission** By the due date set by the chair, the faculty member will submit a *curriculum vitae* and update the annual review information system.

**Procedure** The abridged review is performed by the chair, except on campuses where the review of career-track and short-term faculty is performed by the academic director in consultation with the chair.

**Results** Each abridged review will result in a written report sent by the chair or academic director to the dean and campus VCAA (dependent on the college and WSU campus), and the faculty member reviewed. The report sent to the faculty member should include an invitation to meet face-to-face with the chair or academic director if the faculty member so desires. Reports will contain an annual review rating of either

- (a) Meritorious.
- (b) Satisfactory.
- (c) Less than satisfactory.

If the annual review rating is “less than satisfactory,” the written report must include an explanation for the decision, with explicit and realistic guidance for improvement and all subsequent annual reviews will be comprehensive or intensive until a rating of satisfactory or better is achieved.

### *Comprehensive Review*

**Purpose and Criteria** Comprehensive reviews are intended to evaluate the performance of the faculty member and to provide feedback relative to university and department expectations. Each comprehensive review will consider the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions since the last comprehensive or intensive review in the context of their cumulative performance. All faculty will undergo comprehensive reviews either annually or biennially.

**Submission** By the due date set by the chair or academic director, each faculty member is expected to provide a *curriculum vitae* that includes information concerning education, instructional performance, research activities and publications, awards, professional experience, service activities, and affiliations, as well as a summary of their activities since the last comprehensive or intensive review. Each faculty member is also required to update their information on the annual review information system.

**Procedure** The comprehensive review is performed by the chair except on campuses where the review of career track and short-term faculty is performed by the academic director in consultation with appropriate faculty supervisors at campuses, research and extension centers, or other distant locations.

**Results** Each comprehensive review will result in a written report from the chair or academic director to the dean and campus VCAA (dependent on the college and WSU campus), and the faculty member who was reviewed. The report sent to the faculty member should include an

invitation to meet face-to-face with the chair if the faculty member so desires. Reports will contain the following:

- (a) The faculty member's percentage appointment and primary responsibilities.
- (b) Whether the review is based on an annual or biennial time frame.
- (c) A summary and written evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each of their areas of responsibility, since the last comprehensive or intensive review, viewed in the context of their cumulative performance.
- (d) An assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure or promotion, when applicable.
- (e) An overall annual review rating assigned to the faculty member's performance according to one of the following categories:
  - i. Especially meritorious performance.
  - ii. Strong performance beyond satisfactory.
  - iii. Satisfactory.
  - iv. Some improvement needed.
  - v. Substantial improvement needed.
- (f) An annual review rating, as described above (i.-v.), for each assigned workload category.
- (g) Note that an overall annual review rating of "Especially meritorious performance" is only applicable when every workload category has a ranking of "Satisfactory" or higher, and at least one workload category is ranked as "Especially meritorious performance."

If an annual review rating of "some improvement needed" or "substantial improvement needed" is assigned, then the report will include explicit and realistic guidance to help the faculty member achieve a "satisfactory" or above annual review rating at the next review, which must be comprehensive or intensive. The list should clearly identify areas in which performance is deemed deficient and make specific recommendations for improvement.

Optionally, the report may also contain:

- (a) An evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward previously set goals and expectations, as approved by the chair.
- (b) A list of goals and expectations to be evaluated at the next comprehensive review.
- (c) Additional comments, if any, from the faculty member's immediate supervisor.

For pre-tenured faculty, a rating of "substantial improvement needed" may lead to non-reappointment, as described in section III.F.2. In this event, the faculty member may, within thirty (30) calendar days after notification of non-reappointment, petition the Faculty Status Committee to review the decision upon grounds of inadequate consideration, violation of academic freedom, or substantial procedural irregularity.

Faculty on three (3)- to five (5)-year appointments may have their appointments reduced to one (1) year if a rating of "substantial improvement needed" is assigned.

#### *Intensive Review*

**Purpose and Criteria** The intensive review is a two-part review that includes a comprehensive review and a career progress review. The comprehensive review is the same as for a comprehensive review. The career progress review evaluates the progress of the candidate

towards promotion and/or tenure, provides feedback relative to university and department expectations, identifies relevant deficiencies, and offers recommendations that may assist the candidate in determining future work. Pre-tenured faculty are normally required to undergo one intensive review (typically in the third year), and all faculty who are eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to request an intensive review every four (4) to six (6) years.

**Procedures** The intensive review contains two (2) parts, each with its own rating.

The comprehensive portion of the intensive review is performed by the chair or academic director in consultation with appropriate faculty supervisors at campuses, research and extension centers, or other distant locations, and matches the procedure for the comprehensive review outlined above.

The career progress portion of the intensive review is coordinated by the chair and normally requires participation from all faculty and administrators eligible to perform promotion and tenure evaluations for the candidate. For pre-tenured faculty, the intensive review procedures will match those for final tenure consideration, except that external professional evaluations are not required. For all other faculty, the career progress portion of the review can be limited to the department level.

**Submission** By the due date set by the chair or academic director, each candidate is expected to provide a *curriculum vitae* that includes information concerning education, instructional performance, research activities and publications, awards, professional experience, service activities, and affiliations, as well as copies of select publications and a teaching portfolio. They may submit, in addition, a context statement, a research statement, and descriptions of their external and institutional service activities. Each faculty member is also required to update their information on the annual review information system.

**Results** Each intensive review will result in two (2) reports: a comprehensive review report and a career progress report. The chair will also meet with the candidate face-to-face to discuss both reports.

The comprehensive review report is sent by the chair or academic director to the dean and campus VCAA (dependent on the college and WSU campus), and to the faculty member who is being reviewed. The rating given in the comprehensive review report will serve as the annual review rating anywhere an annual review rating is used.

The career progress report is prepared by the chair and should reflect the views of the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. The report should highlight the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, include recommendations for improvement, and the likelihood of promotion and/or tenure. The candidate should be advised according to the following categories:

- (a) Well prepared. The candidate is encouraged to seek promotion and/or tenure at the next opportunity.
- (b) Satisfactory. The candidate appears to be building an appropriate profile but has not yet achieved the standards expected for promotion and/or tenure.
- (c) Improvement needed. The candidate should review the criteria for promotion and/or tenure and the career progress report carefully and seek advice from other faculty in the university and their discipline.
- (d) Unsatisfactory. The candidate is not on track for promotion and/or tenure.

The chair should meet with the candidate to discuss the review and provide a copy of the career progress report, which includes a summary of strengths, weaknesses, and, for less-than-satisfactory ratings, includes explicit and realistic guidance for improving performance.

For pre-tenured faculty, the career progress report will be sent to the dean and campus VCAA (dependent on the college and WSU campus) and follow the same procedures as that for the final tenure review, except that external professional evaluations are not required. A determination that the progress toward tenure is unsatisfactory could lead to non-reappointment, as described in section III.F of the *Faculty Manual*. In this event, the faculty member may petition the Faculty Status Committee within thirty (30) calendar days after notification of non-reappointment to review the decision with allegations of either inadequate consideration, violation of academic freedom, or substantial procedural irregularity.

#### *Faculty Responses to Annual Review Evaluations*

After receiving the annual review report, the chair shall provide the faculty member a minimum of ten (10) business days to sign the report, indicating that they have had the opportunity to read the report and to discuss it with the chair and/or appropriate faculty supervisors at campuses, research and extension centers, or other distant locations. A faculty member's dissent regarding the contents of the report may be appended to the signed report. When a dissent is appended, the faculty member must receive a written acknowledgment within fifteen (15) business days that the statement has been reviewed by the chair's immediate supervisor (normally the dean) and campus VCAA (dependent on college and WSU campus). At the same time a response is sent to the faculty member, the chair's supervisor will forward to the provost the annual review, the faculty member's response to that review, and the supervisor's acknowledgement to the faculty member. After receiving this information, the provost has an additional fifteen (15) business days to provide a written acknowledgment to the faculty member and chair's supervisor that they have reviewed all the statements.

#### *Information sent to the Provost's Office*

The collection of annual review forms for each college or department will be forwarded to the provost, along with a roster of all faculty required to undergo an annual review, indicating whether the review was intensive, comprehensive, or abridged, and the ratings assigned.

#### *Merit-Based Salary Increases*

If a merit-based raise is available, it will be based on the two (2) most recent annual review reports, with two (2) exceptions:

- (a) For recently appointed faculty members who do not yet have two (2) annual review reports, the merit portion of their salary increase will be based on the available reports.
- (b) If more than two (2) years have passed since a merit increase was available, the raise will be based on the annual review reports since the last merit increase was available.

Ordinarily, salary increases for both annual and academic-year employees will take effect on the same date.