

## Performance Review—Faculty

Responsible Units: President's Office, Academics, Vice President's Office, Human Resources, Associate Vice President's Office

Date Approved: December 2005

Date Revised: July 2010

The purpose of performance review is individual and institutional improvement. To help in achieving this purpose, the performance review process will determine for each faculty member both a quantitative assessment and a qualitative judgment of the faculty member's activities during the review period in the following areas as outlined in the individual's Performance Planning and Evaluation Form (PPE):

- Teaching activities
- Student guidance and advising activities
- Continuing education and community service as related to the program of the College
- Professional development, educational leadership and institutional service

Relative weighting among any and all of these activities will be based on the Performance Planning and Evaluation (PPE) document.

### **Input - Outcome**

To serve this purpose, input from students, colleagues, administrators, and other such sources as are pertinent to the educational unit are to be used. In the assessment of teaching and advising, student appraisal is to be included for at least one semester each year.

The quantitative data are to be provided at least once annually by the faculty member to the Division Assistant Dean through the Performance Planning and Evaluation form (PPE), which covers activities, functions and time, and reports the distribution of effort.

The outcome of this process is a comprehensive review of the performance of the individual faculty member and a plan of action for any needed improvements. At the end of the formal performance review process, the faculty member should have a good understanding of strengths and weaknesses in the areas of responsibility and specific actions to take to make needed improvements.

### **President's Role**

The CEO of each of the KCTCS colleges is responsible for the communication of the procedures to be used in the performance review to the faculty members of the applicable KCTCS college, prior to the beginning of each review process. The evaluation instruments or forms to be used by each KCTCS college will be developed by the college CEO, involving consultation with the appropriate faculty. The college CEO shall provide the KCTCS Human Resources Office with a copy of all local instruments, forms and instructions to be used in the evaluation process on or before October 20.

### **Innovation and Experimentation**

Faculty who are interested in experimental approaches to classroom instruction are requested to confer with their Division Assistant Dean and the appropriate Dean of Academics prior to application of new methodology to make them aware of the intent to modify previous patterns. During the conference issues related to rationale for the new approach, discussion of supporting research related to new methodologies, assessment of resources needed to support experimental methods and methods for evaluating the new approaches should be reviewed. Evaluation of innovative experimental teaching methods are reviewed with a focus upon minimizing any negative impact of student evaluation of instruction.

### **Scholarship and Creative Work**

Scholarship and creative work appropriate to the various fields are to be recognized in performance review.

### **Teamwork and Collaboration**

Teamwork and collaboration appropriate to the various fields (such as interdisciplinary courses, CCD offerings, professional development) are to be recognized in performance review.

### **Standard Evaluation Form**

A standard form will be used for reporting the faculty member's performance for the rating period. This form will include space for written evaluations of each area of the PPE, will provide a legend explaining the descriptive rating categories for the overall performance evaluation, will provide space for an overall written evaluation and recommendations for improvement, and will provide spaces for the signatures of the faculty member, the Division Assistant Dean, and the Dean. Signed copies of the completed form will be made available to the faculty member, and for the files of the Division Assistant Dean and the personnel file, which is maintained by Human Resources.

### **Descriptive Performance Ratings**

The following descriptive performance ratings will be used for a summary evaluation to recognize both outstanding and marginal performance as well as those appraised as degrees of good or satisfactory:

- Consistently Exceeded Expectations of Job Requirements (EE) Job performance was continuously performed in an exceptional manner. Contributions significantly and consistently exceeded expectations and requirements based on established success criteria, with exceptional quality, quantity and timeliness of work. Consistently achieved outstanding results well beyond those expected of the position, and helped achieve KCTCS strategic objectives and goals.
- Met and Frequently Exceeded Job Requirements (ME) Job performance consistently met and frequently exceeded the expectations and requirements for the position based on established success criteria. Contributions consistently met and frequently exceeded expected criteria for quality, quantity and timeliness of work. Frequently achieved results beyond those expected for the position.
- Fully Met Job Requirements (M) Job performance consistently met the expectations and requirements for the position based on established success criteria. Contributions occasionally exceeded expected criteria for quality, quantity and timeliness of work.
- Some Improvement Needed to Meet Job Requirements (NI) Certain job duties were performed capably; however, improvement in quality, quantity, and/ or

timeliness of work is required in order to fully meet expectations and requirements for the position based on established success criteria. A Performance Improvement Plan may be developed by the employee. Performance will be evaluated again in six months. Significant and immediate improvement in quality, quantity and/ or timeliness of work is necessary in order to avoid disciplinary action and/ or termination of employment in accordance with KCTCS policies and procedures regarding employee termination and disciplinary action procedures.

- Did Not Meet Job Requirements (F) Performance throughout the rating period did not meet the job requirements and expectations for the position based upon established success criteria. A Performance Improvement Plan will be immediately developed by the supervisor to facilitate improvement by the employee. Performance will be re-evaluated based on the Performance Improvement Plan and the evaluation goals in at least three months, in six months, and again thereafter if determined necessary. Significant and immediate improvement in quality, quantity and timeliness of work is necessary in order to avoid disciplinary action and/ or termination of employment in accordance with KCTCS policies and procedures regarding employee termination and disciplinary action.

### **Evaluation of Areas of the PPE**

The standard form will provide opportunity for a written evaluation of performance in each active area of the Performance Planning and Evaluation form. Possible active areas are:

- Teaching Activities
- Student Guidance - Advising Activities
- Continuing Education and Community Service as related to the Program of the College

- Professional Activities
- Educational Leadership
- Institutional Service

Written evaluations are required in any active area where performance is judged to be either 1) exceptional or 2) less than expected. Written judgments should be explicit in delineating outcomes (performance) which indicate that the individual faculty member is exceptional or less than expected. Written evaluations are encouraged, but optional, in any active area where performance matches expectations.

### **Overall Written Evaluation and Recommendations for Improvement**

The standard form will provide a space for a written overall evaluation of performance and recommendations for improvement. A written overall evaluation is required. Recommendations for improvement are required if performance in any active area of the PPE has been judged as less than expected. In this situation, specific activities which would help the faculty member improve performance should be listed in this space.

### **Role of Division Assistant Dean and the Deans of Academics**

The Division Assistant Dean, using the various inputs described above, evaluates each faculty member in the division using the Performance Planning and Evaluation form (PPE). In the overall performance rating process, the Division Assistant Dean and the Dean select the evaluation category which best describes the judgment about the faculty member's overall performance. While relative weighting among any and all of the activities of a faculty member will be based on the PPE, the determination of an overall judgment of performance will not be mathematically based on weighting of PPE categories or numerical ratings. Rather, a summative judgment is made taking into consideration the PPE and expectations, unique opportunities pursued, quantity and quality of efforts made, and significance of the faculty member's overall contribution to meeting the goals of the division and the College.

The Division Assistant Dean will recommend an evaluation to the Dean. A conference will then be held between the Vice President of Academics, Dean, and the Division Assistant Dean to discuss the rating of each individual and to attempt to resolve any differences in judgment. There will be only one official rating, that being assigned by the Dean. Following

the conference and after consultation with the Dean to review overall faculty performance of each faculty member, the Division Assistant Dean will meet with each individual faculty member in the division. This meeting will focus on the faculty member's performance of the effort reflected in the PPE for the review period. The Assistant Dean will discuss the various inputs used, the written evaluations of the individual areas of the PPE, the overall performance review rating, and any appropriate recommendations on how to improve performance in areas needing improvement. The official rating will be communicated to the faculty member by the Division Assistant Dean during this meeting.

### **Biennial Ratings**

The performance of non-tenured faculty will be reviewed annually. At the discretion of the college president/ CEO, faculty members with a faculty rank of Associate Professor or higher who were reviewed and rated in the top three categories (EE, ME, or M) during the first year of the biennium have the option to carry forward an M for second year of the biennium or to be reviewed annually.

Faculty members at a rank of Associate Professor or higher who receive a rating below the middle rating during the first year of the biennium shall be reviewed during the second year of the biennium.

### **Appeals**

The faculty member will be provided opportunities for appeal. The President will annually appoint a Faculty Performance Review Appeals Committee to hear appeals to the President made by a faculty member, who, after a conference with the President, remains in disagreement with the rating received. After an appropriate hearing, the Committee will make a recommendation to the President and the President will accept or reject the recommendation of the Committee and advise the faculty member of the decision. If the faculty member remains in disagreement with the decision, the faculty member may appeal to the KCTCS Chancellor for a hearing before a committee appointed by the Chancellor. This committee will meet in a central location to hear the appellant, the President, and the Division Assistant Dean. The committee will make a recommendation to the Chancellor whose decision will be final.

### **Schedule**

The schedule for the review and evaluation process will be distributed by the President.

### **Performance Planning and Evaluation**

The practice of reaching agreement with each faculty member on the distribution of effort for the ensuing academic year will be continued during the Spring Semester. The Division Assistant Dean with the advice of the faculty of that unit will recommend the distribution of the faculty

effort and other resources among the major functions for the ensuing year, taking into account instructional needs, indicated enrollment trends, potential resources available and any other relevant indicators. This recommendation on distribution of effort for each division will be forwarded to the appropriate Dean. The Division Assistant Dean will formalize with each faculty member an agreement on the distribution of effort expected of each faculty member in each major function for the upcoming academic year.

Information assembled in the process of evaluating each faculty member should be utilized by the Division Assistant Dean and/or the Dean in assisting the faculty member in a program of self-improvement in relation to the faculty member's anticipated responsibilities for the forthcoming year. After the completion of the performance review process, the appropriate Dean (and other faculty or staff members) may also be involved in assisting the faculty member in a program of self-improvement.