

Policy Name: CAD Annual Review and Development of Faculty

(RIT policy E7.0)

I. Scope

The College Art and Design is committed to promoting academic excellence. As stated in the University and College's mission statements, teaching, scholarship, and service are core enterprises, and effective teaching continues to be the hallmark of RIT. This policy, consistent with University policy E4.0, supports the dignity and academic freedom of individual faculty members and its implementation is guided by mutual trust based on the shared promotion of academic excellence.

II. Policy Statement

The policy on Annual Review and Development of Faculty establishes guidelines for the evaluation of the performance of full-time faculty in compliance with established University and College criteria as to faculty performance and expectations. An underlying principle of the policy is that faculty review and development are closely related and work in concert to help faculty meet individual, School, College and University goals. The goals of the Annual Review are to:

1. Encourage and foster continued professional development;
2. Provide requisite parts of required documentation as specified in University and College policies;
3. Promote the improvement of individual faculty performance;
4. Inform annual merit increments.

III. Annual Review Process

- A. The immediate supervisor of each full-time faculty member shall ensure that an annual written evaluation is placed in the employee's record. Those who are eligible for contract renewal shall participate in the annual performance review process as described below.
- B. All full-time faculty members in the College of Art and Design **are required to participate** in the annual performance review. This includes faculty who participate in leadership roles or maintain lecturer positions. The classifications of faculty roles include Faculty, Administrative Faculty, Undergraduate Program Director and/or Graduate Director Faculty, and Lecturer (including Principal and Senior Lecturer).
- C. The expectations for a faculty member shall be reflected in the faculty member's Plan of Work; and the Plan of Work is an important element of the annual evaluation (see section G.1 below).
- D. A faculty member receives a performance evaluation for each area of activity as appropriate to his/her faculty role, as well as a recommended overall evaluation rating from their direct report. The performance ratings for evaluating all faculty members with respect to their annual plans of work shall be: Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory.

The performance ratings in each area are:

- **Outstanding** - performance that represents a truly exceptional level of accomplishment.
- **Exceeds Expectations** - performance level that exceeds the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member.
- **Meets Expectations** - performance that meets the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectation for a given faculty member.
- **Does Not Meet Expectations** - performance that does not meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member. This rating indicates a deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.
- **Unsatisfactory** - performance that repeatedly fails to meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member in a way that reflects disregard of previous reviews or other efforts to provide correction or assistance.

Faculty receiving a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory should work with his/her School Director to actively seek assistance to improve her/his job performance.

- E. The criteria for the Annual Review follow the performance criteria outlined in the University policies for tenure (E5.0) and promotion (E6.0), as well as corresponding CAD guidelines. The application of specific criteria and their weight may vary due to the particular expectations of academic units and particular faculty classifications (E1.0) and rank (E6.0) expectations. For questions about performance criteria, faculty members should consult with their direct report. The provost will oversee the consistent application of the performance criteria and the annual increment associated with the performance criteria.
1. **Faculty** - evaluation criteria include teaching, scholarship, and service.
 2. **Administrative Faculty** - evaluation criteria include teaching, scholarship, service, and leadership/administration.
 3. **Faculty fulfilling role of Undergraduate Program Director and/or Graduate Director** - evaluation criteria include teaching, scholarship, service, and academic leadership.
 4. **Lecturer** (including Principal and Senior) - evaluation criteria include teaching and service.
- F. The timeline of the Annual Review is January 1 through December 31. Dates for submission, review and approval are:
1. All self-evaluation materials must be submitted to faculty member's School Director (or Dean, if administrative faculty) at the start of the Spring semester.
 2. School Directors (or the Dean for administrative faculty) provide written evaluations and ratings for each area of performance as well as a recommended overall rating (as per RIT policy E7, section II.F.3) to the Dean's office by mid-March.
 3. The Dean reviews and signs the administrative chair's evaluations and faculty plans of work by April 15 or the next business day. She/he includes a brief statement and a final overall rating regarding faculty member's performance during the evaluation period.

G. In CAD, the Annual Review Process includes the following elements:

1. Plan of Work

Fundamental to the self-evaluation process is the annual plan of work. It serves as the primary supporting document for each faculty member's self-evaluation of her/his performance during the review period. The plan of work is a document that faculty prepare in the spring of each academic year outlining the faculty member's expected work activities, anticipated outcomes, and specific performance expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for the following academic year's contract period. The plan of work should explicitly address any items of concern that emerge from the annual review process. The plan of work may also describe how work activities will fit with the faculty member's longer-term performance or promotion aspirations.

- a. A plan of work must explicitly define a balanced set of goals for the self-evaluation review period in terms of "activities" and "evidence".
- b. Each faculty member's plan of work, including how performance criteria will be applied and weighted, will be negotiated and approved by the faculty member's direct report, i.e. School Director or Dean.
- c. At a minimum, the plan of work must be approved and signed by the faculty member, School Director, and Dean. An approved plan of work shall be finalized after the annual review is complete, but no later than the beginning of the faculty member's contract period for the upcoming academic year. For faculty in their first year at RIT, their initial contract letters shall serve as their plans of work, unless superseded by an agreed upon plan of work.

2. Faculty Self-Evaluation

The faculty member's written self-evaluation and evidence of performance against the criteria specified above (III.E) and the elements of the plan of work that overlap with the review period. Evidence of performance should include at a minimum the following:

- a. Results from the core and college questions on the university-wide student rating of instruction survey for all sections assigned in the plan of work will be accessible through the RIT Student Rating System at a disaggregated level. If course sections are assigned to a faculty member for an academic term for which the RIT Student Rating System is not available as a tool to conduct a student rating of instruction survey, the college shall implement an equivalent instruction survey for students to complete and the results of which will be maintained in the faculty member's file in the Dean's Office. Student ratings shall not be the sole source of data used to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Response rates should be taken into consideration when reviewing student ratings. Other possible teaching effectiveness data may include alumni ratings; peer ratings; self-assessment statements; syllabi and other course documents; examples of student work; and teaching portfolios.
- b. Evidence of scholarly achievement and quality as defined by the faculty member's College and School for the review period.
- c. Written confirmation of participation on School, College and University committees and self-assessment of performance on those committees and professional service activities.

3. **A written evaluation provided by faculty member's direct report**, i.e. School Director or Dean, rating the faculty member's performance in each area of activity as well as a recommended overall performance rating.

The written evaluation will be based on objective criteria as applied to the performance of the faculty member in the core areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The criteria include performance expectations as established by the College, School or academic unit and established standards of performance in the faculty member's particular academic and scholarly field. Faculty will not be evaluated on her/his performance relative to other faculty in her/his School or academic unit. The written evaluation also includes a performance rating (see II.C) in the key areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship/creative activity, and service. At the end of the evaluation a comprehensive rating will be applied as a summation of ratings individually applied in the three key areas of evaluation. Where applicable, the direct report's written evaluation of the self-evaluation must include an indication of progress for the tenure-track faculty member as well as for faculty members seeking promotion in faculty rank.

- H. A meeting between faculty member and her/his direct report, i.e. School Director or Dean, to discuss the results of the evaluation process and the plan of work for the subsequent Annual Review period.

Outcomes of this meeting may include modification of Plan of Work, amendment of direct report's evaluation, etc. Faculty members **may submit a written response** to her/his direct report's annual evaluation. In this event, a written response is submitted along with the direct report's evaluation for the Dean's review and official response. It becomes part of the official documentation.

- I. Faculty will sign and date the final annual review including amendments, when applicable, and proposed Plan of Work. This signature does not represent faculty approval of the content of the annual evaluation but that that review, and its amendments have been received and read in compliance with University and College policies. The original documents shall be retained on file in the Office of the Dean and in accordance with C22.0 -Records Management Policy. A copy of the final documents shall be provided to the faculty member immediately upon completion of the process.
- J. Faculty members who believe that this policy has been unfairly or improperly implemented are referred to the policies on Faculty Grievance (RIT E24.0), Appeal Committee on Faculty Salaries (RIT E14.0), and Discrimination and Harassment (RIT C6.0).

IV. Faculty Development Process

- A. Tenure-track faculty who are rated as Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory in either teaching or scholarship must work with their School Director to develop and implement an appropriate plan of improvement. To facilitate improvement, faculty may be eligible for a Faculty Improvement Fund (FIF) grant to support the plan. These funds are distributed by the Dean.
- B. Each faculty member's approved plan of work identifies areas of development which address the University's educational goals or department, College, or University strategic plans. They shall be eligible to apply for professional development assistance from the University. Examples of assistance include but are not limited to collegial mentoring, opportunities to take courses, release time, financial assistance, tutoring, or supplies. Requests for such development assistance should follow the process outlined below in C.

- C. Tenure-track faculty, senior lecturers, principal lecturers, and lecturers with multiple year contracts, are eligible for funds from the Faculty Education and Development (FEAD) fund. These funds shall be appropriated by the University to each college in proportion to the number of tenure-track faculty, senior and principal lecturers, and lecturers with multiple year contracts. Disbursement of these funds shall proceed as follows:
1. Each college shall establish a FEAD Committee to consist of no fewer than three members, elected from and by the tenure-track faculty of the college. If a college has another committee whose membership complies with these specifications, the faculty of the College may designate it as the FEAD Committee.
 2. The FEAD Committee shall initiate a request for proposals from eligible faculty members. Proposals will be due by a date to be established CAD.
 3. Proposals for FEAD funding must include a statement from the School Director indicating support for the proposal.
 4. The FEAD Committee shall review proposals and make funding recommendations to the Dean. If he/she does not concur with the recommendations made by the College's FEAD Committee, the Dean shall communicate this objection to the committee and an informal resolution shall be pursued. In situations where the Dean and the committee cannot reach a resolution regarding a FEAD award, the provost shall be the final arbiter.
 5. The Dean shall be responsible for the disbursement of faculty development awards.

Responsible Office:

Dean's office

Effective Date: August, 2014

Policy History: Updated College Name Change November, 2023