

Self-Initiated Faculty Annual Reviews Q & A

1. What are the faculty's rights and responsibilities regarding Faculty Annual Reviews?

The Faculty Annual Review (FAR) and Assessment of Performance Process is derived from institutional and system policies, including but not limited to, the Faculty Personnel Policies ([chap.3.21](#)); Unclassified Personnel Guidelines ([UPG #1](#); [UPG #2.03](#); and [UPG #12](#)); Articles of Faculty Governance ([Art. #4](#)) and UW System Policy [20-9](#). These policies guide the faculty's governance rights and obligations. They are created or altered in consultation between the chancellor and the faculty under the authority of the UW Board of Regents and state legislature.

2. What is the annual time line for conducting Faculty Annual Reviews?

Based on precedent established in prior years, reviews would occur between January 1 and March 31 of every given year unless a promotion or tenured faculty review is scheduled. Review timeframes are meant to align with the new fiscal year beginning in July.

For work completed in 2015 and reviews conducted early 2016, faculty members can choose to participate in the expanded pilot with the Faculty Annual Review or participate in the administrative SIPR process as in past years.

3. Who initiates the Faculty Annual Review and how is it shared?

- a. The review process is self-initiated by the faculty member under review using the recommended **Outline** developed by an ad hoc faculty committee. The review process is subject to adoption by each academic department.
- b. This review will serve as the annual performance review for that faculty member. UWEX Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 3.21 reads, "Written summary copies of the review shall be provided to the faculty member, the administrative unit chair, grant funding source (if required), and the academic department chair, and be included in the faculty member's personnel file". Additional guidance can be found in UPG#2.

<http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-UPG2.pdf>

4. Who provides the leadership for conducting the Faculty Annual Review?

According to UWEX FACULTY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES - Chapter 3 at <http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-Faculty-Chapter3.pdf>:

3.21 Annual reviews. Annually the academic department chair and/or administrative unit chair (depending on where one functions) or a small committee elected for this purpose shall review with each faculty member job conditions, the individual's performance, potential advancement, and further career developmental opportunities, consistent with Unclassified Personnel Policy (UPG) #1.

NOTE: In this context, the "administrative unit chair" is the Faculty Governance Unit Chair, who may or may not be the same as the county-based Department Head.

- a. In those units where the faculty governance unit chair is also the administrative department head, the faculty governance unit chair shall conduct the review of the faculty member under review.¹
- b. In those units where the faculty governance unit chair and administrative department head are two separate faculty members, the faculty governance unit chair shall conduct the review with participation by the faculty member who is the administrative department head.
- c. In those units where the faculty governance unit chair and administrative department head are two separate individuals and the administrative department head is an academic staff person, the faculty governance unit chair shall conduct the review with participation by another faculty member from the faculty governance unit. The faculty member may request input from the academic staff member serving as the administrative head.
- d. When the faculty member under review is the faculty governance unit chair, the academic department chair shall conduct the review or elect a committee for that purpose. Another faculty member from the faculty governance unit shall participate in the review in those cases where the annual performance review is conducted by the academic department chair or a committee appointed for that purpose.
- e. Faculty who are administrative department heads may still be subject to an administrative performance review for that portion of their appointment.

¹*The faculty member under review has the option of requesting that the academic department chair or a small committee elected for that purpose conduct the review in lieu of the faculty governance unit chair.*

5. Will I participate in a FAR if there are promotional or tenured faculty reviews scheduled?

Any promotional review of a faculty member shall function as the faculty annual review in the year in which the promotion is requested. The tenured faculty review shall function as the faculty annual review in the year in which a tenured faculty member is subject to tenured faculty review. Academic departments may choose to conduct additional performance evaluations of probationary faculty focused on criteria established by the department.

6. Who Initiates the FAR, the faculty member or the FGU chair?

The faculty member initiates his/her own FAR by determining what and who they choose to include in the review process.

7. What is the rationale for having the FGU chair conduct faculty reviews?

In addition to the collegial support of faculty reviewing faculty, the primary rationale for having the FGU chair conduct the review is based on the importance of local input and perspective as it relates to the faculty members' internal and external relationships. This may be lost if academic departments conducted the review without local input.

When a faculty member opts to use their ADC for the annual review, the local input would be provided by the FGU chair or another faculty member from the faculty member's unit.

8. How will local input be sought or included in FAR process?

The local input dimension of the review process is sought out by the faculty member being reviewed and by input provided by the FGU chair.

At the invitation of the faculty member being reviewed, an (academic staff) county-based Department Head can participate in the review.

9. Will there be orientation and training for FGUs?

Training and orientation for FGU chairs on the FAR model will be provided in a joint program of academic departments. The multi-department FAR training is to ensure consistent adoption and implementation across county-based academic departments where faculty members under review and the FGU chairs may reside in different academic department homes. Training will be available early in 2016 for governance units using the FAR process in 2016. ADCs need to ensure that their respective departments are informed about the FAR process.

10. What else in addition to the: *Self –initiated Faculty Annual Review and Assessment Outline*, may be include in the FAR?

UPG#1 <http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-UPG1.pdf> provides the framework for the development of the FAR form and process.

The *Self – initiated Faculty Annual Review and Assessment of Performance Outline* guides the review process. Faculty members may provide additional information allowing them to more thoroughly demonstrate their scholarly work (i.e.), work plans, statements of intent, mentor input, program impacts, etc.

11. Upon completion of the FAR who is responsible for writing up the summary, acquiring needed signatures, and sharing the review summary? (See response to Q3)

FGU chairs are expected to write a summary review letter attaching it to the: *Self-initiated Faculty Annual Review and Assessment of Performance Outline*.

There is also an expectation that both the FGU chair and the faculty member being reviewed sign the form and narrative summary statement to validate the review process was completed.

The reviewer (FGU or ADC) is responsible for providing signed written summary copies of the review to the faculty member, the administrative unit chair (FGU), grant funding source (if required), the academic department chair, and be included in the faculty member's personnel file. NOTE: A county-based faculty member's personnel file is held by the Regional Director who serves as the hiring authority. The reviewer (FGU or ADC) forwards the review for county-based faculty members to the Regional Director. Further distribution (for example to the county department head) is at the discretion of the faculty member being reviewed.

What about department members who are specialists?

For specialists or statewide faculty, the program area office maintains the personnel file and should receive a copy of specialist or statewide faculty review summary documents from the reviewer (FGU or ADC).

12. May administrative input be shared during the FAR or vice versa?

FAR does not preclude input from administration. Input from administration (Program Director, Regional Directors, County Department Heads and Oversight Committee Member, etc.) may be sought out by the faculty member.

Chapter 3.21 “Written summary copies of the review shall be provided to the faculty member, the administrative unit chair, grant funding source (if required), and the academic department chair, and be included in the faculty member’s personnel file”.

Additional guidance can be found in UPG#2 - <http://www.uwex.edu/human-resources/policies/UW-Extension-UPG2.pdf>

13. How will administration participate in the FAR process? How can input from regional & program directors be included?

The mechanism for including input from regional directors and programs directors is still being discussed. The concept of a “*multi-rater*” input tool for administration is being considered by administration.

14. How will we avoid multiple reviews?

Faculty has the responsibility for reviewing Faculty. Administration has been supportive of the faculty annual review process outlined. With their support we anticipate that the FAR will be the only review unless a faculty member is also a County Department Head. County Department Heads may still be reviewed by their regional directors as in the past. That review is related to the person’s administrative responsibilities within their respective county offices or area.

15. What if there are performance concerns? Who is responsible for bringing those forward?

The FAR is not a disciplinary tool. There are institutional processes in place for poor performance. Academic Department Chairs, by the nature of the FAR process, will become aware of poor performance.

16. What if there are workplace issues? Who is responsible for making those known?

Local input is important in the review process. County department heads/area leaders in their administrative role are responsible for addressing workplace issues.

17. Does the reviewer make recommendations or just sign off?

Any considerations for improvement need to be collegial. If performance issues are identified in the FAR the respective Academic Department Chair should be involved in initiating follow up discussions.

18. If recommendations are made or improvements needed, who monitors or follows up?

There will be different scenarios based on faculty rank. The FAR is not a disciplinary tool. It is tool to provide collegial support of faculty.

19. Can mentor teams conduct the reviews for probationary faculty rather than FGUCs?

That would be a department by department decision. There are however numerous advantages for academic departments to use a similar review process across departments and an expectation on the part of administration that there is consistency across departments.

20. Will academic departments have flexibilities with the review process or tool?

Departments have the final decision on how the department members are reviewed. Consistency across departments would however be very helpful and requested by administration.

21. What if I do not have a FGU chair in my governance Unit?

Faculty members within the unit are expected to elect a FGU chair as soon as possible so the reviews can be completed in a timely manner

22. What if I do not complete a FAR in 2016?

There is an expectation from both within faculty governance bodies and administration that faculty members complete an annual review. Is the default in 2016 the administrative review known as the SIPR? Not having a recent annual review on file may eliminate faculty from consideration for merit based salary adjustments.

Faculty Annual Review ad hoc Committee
10/16/15
Cooperative Extension Academic Department Chairs
11/17/2015
Final Edits 1/6/2016