

## **UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI**

### **POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY**

This policy is intended to aid the faculty and academic Unit Heads in compliance with H.B. 152's prescription to have in place an annual performance review for all members of the faculty (and all administrative employees).

The language of the current contract between the University of Cincinnati and the American Association of University Professors, University of Cincinnati Chapter, specifies annual performance meetings between Academic Unit Heads and non-tenured faculty (Article 7.1.2) following an initial meeting within the first three months of a new faculty member's appointment (Article 7.1.1). The contract also encourages annual meetings between faculty and Academic Unit Heads to promote professional growth and development (Article 31.2.4).

The annual performance review is seen as complementary to each unit's workload policy and procedures and its mission statements. The annual performance review provides an opportunity to review what was expected of a faculty member as set forth by the workload procedures of that unit as well as the extent to which the mission of the unit is enhanced and supported by the faculty member's activities.

The annual performance review allows the faculty member and the Academic Unit Head to discuss changes in the interests and skills of the faculty member that would change the contributions that the faculty member could make to the unit. It would also allow a discussion of the resources needed by the faculty member to develop or maintain skills, interests, research, scholarship and the like focusing on teaching, research, professional, University, and public service. In this way the annual performance review is both a setting for anticipating the next year and a review of the past. The annual performance review also allows for the accumulation of evidence for the performance of the faculty member who may be tenured but has not achieved all the promotions available. Others may find it helpful to have a record of review and performance when supervisors and Academic Unit Heads change.

While the review may include accumulating evidence of a faculty member's performance (teaching evaluations, teaching portfolios, new course offerings, grants obtained, papers given and published, contracts negotiated, and the like), the primary purpose for the review is not simply to record an evaluation of a faculty member's performance for the year. The annual performance review works best when it is an instrument for faculty and unit development.

There is no one format that would work best for all units. A good many examples already exist on campus of annual performance reviews that are supported by the faculty of units and have proven to be useful. Such past practices should be continued and encouraged.

Whatever format the unit devises, it must address teaching, advising, educational innovation, research and creative activity, university, professional, and public service, and other accomplishments pertinent to the mission of the unit balanced according to the unit's mission and workload.

## **PROCEDURES**

Each academic unit must establish procedures for the annual performance review of all faculty members. These procedures shall be established with the full participation and approval of the members of the faculty within each academic unit and library jurisdiction in the Bargaining Unit, but are subject to written approval by the appropriate dean or library administrator and by the appropriate provost. After approval, all annual reviews shall be conducted according to these procedures. The AAUP and the Administration will make available to academic units examples of performance review instruments and procedures as well as consultation as requested by the academic unit. It is expected that with experience, the procedures developed initially may be modified; any modifications shall be with the full participation and approval of faculty, dean, and provost.

Each annual performance review shall conclude with the joint preparation of a written summary of the review. Either the Academic Unit Head or the faculty member may indicate in writing any differing opinions about the content of the summary statement and such written opinion shall become part of the summary statement. These statements shall become part of the personnel file maintained by each academic unit and a copy of the statement shall be given to the faculty member.

Each Academic Unit Head will annually certify, in a report to the appropriate dean or academic administrator, that all faculty have undergone performance reviews. This report will enable the unit also to convey or address its resource needs for the following year. It might be expected that if annual performance reviews are integrated with workload procedures and mission statements reports could be made about the ways each academic unit is attaining its stated mission both for individual faculty members and for the unit as a whole.

Academic Unit Heads present a particularly difficult dilemma for annual performance reviews. They face in at least two directions: towards the faculty and towards the administration. Therefore, the annual performance review of academic unit heads shall take into account their role as faculty members and administrators in their unit. In carrying out the annual reviews, deans must consult with the faculty in the unit about the review of the head.