**University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University Libraries
Procedures for Faculty Evaluation and Reappointment/ Peer Review**May 2, 2013

**Introduction**

1. Each employee must be evaluated annually per 4.6 of the *Bylaws* of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska and 2.3.1 of the *Bylaws* of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The process includes:
2. a written performance evaluation and an oral evaluation (as defined in section 21, on page 7);
3. completion of the *Apportionment Form* using the *Process for Deciding Apportionment of Responsibilities*;
4. review of the *Position Description; and*
5. depending upon tenure status, request, or rank, a reappointment process or a peer review.
6. The Associate Dean for Administration may delegateher/his duties, addressed in this document to a designee.
7. The evaluation process for each faculty member involves an evaluator and a reviewer. The evaluator is the faculty member’s immediate supervisor. The reviewer is normally the faculty member’s next higher supervisor. The Associate Dean for Administration, or his/her designee, serves as reviewer for faculty who report directly to the Dean of Libraries. The other Associate Dean serves as reviewer for the Associate Dean for Administration.

**Categories and Timing**

1. Procedures for all faculty evaluations are similar. Differences, based on rank and/or tenure status, fall into three categories outlined below. The Associate Dean for Administration notifies the faculty member and the evaluator of the evaluation/reappointment/peer review dates and deadlines.

**NOTE:** The *COART Timelines* documents, published annually, should be consulted for specific deadlines.

**4.1** **Pre-tenure faculty.** In addition to an annual evaluation, all pre-tenure faculty undergo a reappointment process each year. The reappointment and evaluation processes, typically are concurrent, with two exceptions (see 4.1.1 and 4.1.5, below). Pre-tenure faculty members are evaluated in time to give the faculty member notice of the Dean's reappointment recommendation as specified in 4.4.2 of Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska.

**4.1.1** An evaluation (not a reappointment) is conducted three months after a faculty member begins a new position, unless the evaluation coincides with the first evaluation/ reappointment timeline (see 4.1.2 below). An individual serves on the faculty at least three months before an evaluation occurs.

**4.1.2** A faculty member's first evaluation/reappointment typically occurs in January/February.

**4.1.3** The second year evaluation/reappointment takes place during the following October/November, approximately 9-10 months after the first evaluation/reappointment.

**4.1.4** The next three annual evaluations/reappointments occur during February-April with the first beginning 17-18 months after 4.1.3.

**4.1.5** In October, prior to the faculty member’s consideration for Continuous Appointment and Promotion, an evaluation (not a reappointment) is conducted.

* 1. **Tenured faculty not fully promoted;**

**faculty with the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor of Practice; and**

**faculty with the rank of Assistant or Associate Research Professor.**

In addition to an annual evaluation, which occurs in March/April, these faculty members may choose to undergo a peer review.

Any of these faculty members may request and schedule a peer review at any time in any year. The intent of the peer review is to advise faculty members on career development and/or their progress toward promotion. Therefore, information from the peer review is notto be incorporated into the evaluation.

* 1. **Tenured and fully promoted faculty members** are evaluated in March/April each year.

**General Procedures Prior to Oral Evaluation and Reappointment/Peer Review**

1. **Associate Dean for Administration Actions.** The Associate Dean for Administration**:**
	1. Notifies the evaluator and the faculty member of upcoming dates for the evaluation and reappointment/peer review processes, as determined by COART;
	2. Announces a deadline for completion of the evaluation and reappointment/peer review processes and reminds faculty and staff involved in the process of the location of the electronic evaluation and reappointment forms;
	3. Compiles a folder for each faculty member preparing for reappointment or peer review. This folder contains all of the faculty member's position descriptions, previous performance evaluations, and, for pre-tenure faculty, any previous reappointment statements.
2. **Pre-evaluation conference.** Prior to writing the evaluation and/or meeting of any reappointment or peer review committee, the faculty member may request a pre-evaluation conference with the evaluator. The faculty member and evaluator arrange a time for the meeting. The pre-evaluation conference is NOT an evaluation of the faculty member. It offers the evaluator an opportunity to review criteria for measuring job performance with the faculty member, and offers the faculty member an opportunity to highlight professional activities of which the evaluator may be unaware. Either party may ask the Associate Dean for Administration and/or the reviewer to be present during the pre-evaluation conference.
3. **Change in supervision**. If requested, when a faculty member transfers to another evaluator or an evaluator leaves a position, the original evaluator conducts an exit evaluation for the faculty member who has not been evaluated within the last three months.
4. **Change in evaluator.** If the faculty member has had a change in evaluators within three months of the date of the current evaluation, the new evaluator should read the faculty member's exit evaluation, if one is available.
5. **Solicitation of information for evaluation.** The evaluator solicits information from the faculty member's supervisees and colleagues. The evaluator announces an upcoming evaluation to all faculty and staff and asks for information relevant to the evaluation from all who may have information to contribute. The recommended language for this solicitation is:

“The following faculty member(s) is/are currently undergoing annual performance evaluation(s): [name of faculty member(s)]

If you have any relevant input to make regarding the job performance or professional development contributions and activities of any of these/this faculty member(s) since their last evaluation (date), please send it to me by [deadline].

Please comment only on things you have directly observed or experienced about their work.

If you send your comments via email, please make sure you respond using the Reply button, not Reply To All.

If you would like to serve on the peer review/reappointment committee for any of these candidates, please let me know.”

**Procedures for Reappointment and Written Evaluation of Pre-tenure Faculty**

1. **Folder preparation by faculty member.** All pre-tenure faculty prepare folders for review by their Reappointment committee following the *COART Guidance for Documentation Development* document. The folder documentation is cumulative reflecting the progress and development of the faculty member over time.
2. **Reappointment Committee.** The evaluator is required to convene and chair a Reappointment Committee for pre-tenure faculty members to gather input for the faculty member's evaluation and reappointment recommendation. The evaluator notifies Reappointment Committee members when the faculty member’s folders are available for review.

**11.1** The Reappointment Committee consists of all tenured faculty in the faculty member's department or unit. In addition, the evaluator and the pre-tenure faculty member collaboratively each choose one to five tenured faculty members from outside the department or unit. The Committee must consist of at least three tenured faculty members. Some overlap of committee membership from one year to the next is encouraged.

* 1. If the faculty member is at the department chair level, the evaluator convenes and chairs a Reappointment Committee of all tenured faculty at the department chair level. In addition, the evaluator and the pre-tenure faculty member collaboratively each choose a tenured faculty member from the faculty member's department or unit. If there are less than three tenured members in the department or unit, all tenured faculty members in the department or unit must serve. If there are less than two tenured faculty members in the department or unit, additional tenured faculty from other departments or units are chosen.
	2. If the faculty member is an associate dean, the evaluator convenes and chairs a committee of all tenured faculty members at the department chair level.
1. **Reappointment Committee Meeting.** The evaluator convenes and chairs a Reappointment Committee to review the pre-tenure faculty member's folders and other relevant information. The Committee discusses the candidate's progress towards tenure. The Committee chair has an obligation to indicate to the Committee when advice being offered differs and/or conflicts from previous years and to seek an understanding of why the advice differs. The Committee chair summarizes the major points of discussion that will be relayed to the faculty member. The Committee then makes a recommendation of reappointment or non-reappointment. If the Committee is split on whether to reappoint, a vote is taken. While the evaluator considers the recommendation of the Committee, the recommendation of reappointment or non-reappointment ultimately reflects the judgment of the evaluator. The faculty member may choose to attend the reappointment committee meeting after the vote is taken for a discussion of the decision, recommendations and advice.
2. **Form Completion.** The evaluator completes and signs the *Performance Evaluation* form, and a *Recommendation for Reappointment* form regarding the pre-tenure faculty member.

**13.1** Issues raised by the Reappointment Committee members and comments solicited from staff are incorporated into the written evaluation and reappointment forms. If any of the new comments are negative and would be a surprise to the faculty member, they should be placed in the comments section as an area for growth and should not be incorporated into the numerical ranking. If the Committee has recommended area(s) for the candidate to work on, this recommendation is to be indicated in the evaluation.

* 1. The purpose of the completed reappointment form is to explain the rationale for the recommendation: Reappoint or Do not reappoint. Issues are to be clearly spelled out, including strengths and areas where improvement is needed. The evaluator is to be explicit in expressing the Reappointment Committee's expectations.
	2. The completed reappointment form is to also serve as a guide to upcoming reappointment committees and the promotion and tenure committee. The form is to address whether or not the faculty member has made progress in meeting the expectations of the Reappointment Committee from year to year so that there is a track record for the candidate. Issues must be in writing rather than only handled at the oral evaluation.
	3. The completed reappointment form should reflect areas where growth is needed. When the faculty member is making good progress overall, constructive criticism is beneficial. The form is to indicate whether the faculty member has made progress in meeting the recommendations from the previous year. If no improvement was evident, the problem must be addressed explicitly. Expectations are to be stated clearly. If the form indicates that the latest Committee's recommendations disagree with the previous recommendations, the form must state why the advice has changed.
	4. In completing the reappointment form, the evaluator is to use precise language. For example, if committee "recommends," the word "suggests" should not be used.
	5. The completed reappointment form is to be reviewed by at least one other member of the Reappointment Committee to insure that important issues have been addressed and addressed clearly.
	6. After Form Distribution, Oral Evaluation and Followup are completed (see 20.-22.5) the Dean makes the final reappointment recommendation and a letter is sent with that information to the faculty member and the evaluator.

* 1. The Dean of Libraries may reconvene the reappointment committee if s**/**he has questions or seeks clarification and information.
1. **Role of the evaluator in the Reappointment process.** The evaluator is responsible for mentoring a faculty member through the reappointment and continuous appointment process, clarifying expectations, and offering guidance for improved performance. By the second reappointment, the faculty member is advised to select and begin working on their areas of professional contributions as described in the University Libraries' *Promotion and Appointment Criteria*, latest version. If the faculty member does not respond to recommendations nor meet expectations, it is appropriate to counsel the faculty member about career options.

**Procedures for Peer Review and Written Evaluation of Tenured Not Fully Promoted Faculty, Faculty with Rank of Assistant/Associate Professor of Practice, and Faculty with Rank of Assistant/Associate Research Professor**

1. **Folder preparation by faculty member.** All peer review candidates prepare folders for review by their committee following the *COART Guidance for Documentation Development* document. The folder documentation is cumulative reflecting the progress and development of the faculty member over time.
2. **Peer review.** Upon request by a tenured not fully promoted faculty member, a faculty member with the rank of Assistant/ Associate Professor of Practice or Assistant/Associate Research Professor, a peer review will be held. The evaluator convenes and chairs a Peer Review Committee consisting of library faculty members with the rank of associate professor or professor, chosen by negotiation between the faculty member and the evaluator, and capable of providing a fair and unbiased assessment of the faculty member’s performance. The number of faculty chosen is at the discretion of the faculty member, ordinarily 3-5 individuals. The faculty member may choose to attend all, part or none of the peer review meeting. The written report of the Review Committee is provided solely to the faculty member. The Committee is also to provide guidance on how to achieve promotion. The University Libraries’ *Post-Tenure Review Procedures* may be consulted for further procedural information.
3. **Evaluation.** The evaluator completes and signs the *Performance Evaluation* form and incorporates issues and comments solicited from faculty or staff. If any of the new comments are negative and would be a surprise to the faculty member, they should be placed in the comments section as an area for growth and should not be incorporated into the numerical ranking. If there are areas recommended for the candidate to work on, those recommendations are to be indicated in the evaluation.

**Procedures for Written Evaluation of Tenured and Fully Promoted Faculty**

1. **Evaluation.** The evaluator completes and signs the *Performance Evaluation* form and incorporates comments solicited from faculty or staff. If any of the new comments are negative and would be a surprise to the faculty member, they should be placed in the comments section as an area for growth and should not be incorporated into the numerical ranking.

**Procedures for Written Evaluation of Faculty with Supervisory Responsibilities**

1. The Associate Dean for Administration sends notification concerning the deadline, electronic location of the *Supervisory Performance Evaluation--Employee Input* form to be used, and directions for submitting the completed form. By University guidelines, these forms are confidential, but not anonymous. The evaluator shares the information from the confidential evaluations with any Reappointment or Peer Review Committee and incorporates it into the *Performance Evaluation* and any reappointment/ peer review recommendations. The supervisor under evaluation does not see the *Supervisory Performance Evaluation-- Employee Input* forms. The evaluator and the reviewer each review the forms.

**19.1** **For Supervisors** the *Supervisory Performance Evaluation--Employee Input* forms may be completed by all employees directly supervised by the faculty member.

* 1. **For Department or Unit Chairs** the *Supervisory Performance Evaluation-- Employee Input Forms* may be completed by personnel in 19.1, as well as all other faculty and managerial/professional line employees in the department or unit who are not directly supervised by the Chair.
	2. **For Associate Deans** the *Supervisory Performance Evaluation--Employee Input* forms are sent to all department chair level faculty and all faculty directly supervised by the Associate Dean. All personnel may submit a form or respond to the solicitation of information for evaluation (see 9.).

**Form Distribution, Oral Evaluation and Followup**

1. **Disbursement of completed forms.** The evaluator gives a copy of the completed *Performance Evaluation* form to the faculty member, and the original to the reviewer, at least five (5) working days prior to the scheduled oral evaluation. For pre-tenure faculty the completed *Recommendation for Reappointment* form is also included. At the same time, the evaluator gives all originals of any confidential *Supervisory Performance Evaluation-- Employee Input* forms to the reviewer.
2. **Oral evaluations.** The faculty member meets with the evaluator and the reviewer to discuss the written performance evaluation. For the protection of both parties, no formal oral evaluation is to take place without the reviewer present. The reviewer may not add comments to the completed evaluation form prior to the oral evaluation.
	1. For pre-tenure faculty members, the evaluator also discusses his/her recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment and summarizes the discussion from the Reappointment Committee, including their recommendation. If a recommendation for non-reappointment is made, the evaluator schedules a meeting for the faculty member to be counseled by the Associate Dean for Administration about available options.
	2. For all faculty members, the *Apportionment Form* and *Position Description* are also reviewed, discussed and any revisions agreed upon.
	3. The role of the reviewer in the oral evaluation includes any of the following activities:
		1. Ensuring that the information from the *Supervisory Performance Evaluation-- Employee Input* forms is kept strictly confidential and is incorporated fairly into the completed evaluation form.
		2. Clarifying comments not understood.
		3. Moderating when the discussion strays from the central points of the evaluation.
		4. Promoting clear communication in cases of misunderstanding.
		5. Serving as a witness of record.
3. **After the oral evaluation is completed.** The *Performance Evaluation* form, *Apportionment Form*, *Position Description*, *Recommendation for Reappointment* form for pre-tenure faculty members, and any confidential *Supervisory Performance Evaluation--Employee Input* forms are handled as follows:
	1. **Faculty member signature.** The faculty member signs and dates the original evaluation form in blue ink, indicating thereby that he/she has seen the form and that an oral evaluation was held. The signature of the faculty member does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation. The faculty member also signs and dates the completed *Apportionment Form.*
	2. **Reviewer signature.** The reviewer also signs the evaluation form, indicating thereby that an oral conference relating to the faculty member's work was held and that the faculty member saw the evaluation form. The original form(s) are then turned over to the Associate Dean for Administration.
	3. **Faculty member commentary.** Should the faculty member wish to submit a commentary regarding the written evaluation form(s) or the oral conference, such written commentary must be delivered to the Associate Dean for Administration within three (3) working days following the oral evaluation. The Associate Dean for Administration attaches the written commentary to the written form(s). The faculty member also sends copies to each participant at the oral evaluation.
	4. **Evaluator/reviewer commentary and faculty member response.** Should the evaluator and/or the reviewer wish to submit a commentary regarding the written form(s) or on the oral conference, such written commentary must be delivered to the Associate Dean for Administration within three (3) working days following the oral evaluation. The Associate Dean for Administration attaches it to the form(s). The evaluator and/or reviewer also send(s) copies to each participant at the oral evaluation.

**Faculty member response.** The faculty member may respond in writing to the commentary within three (3) working days of receipt thereof, by sending such response to the Associate Dean for Administration. The Associate Dean for Administration attaches it to the form(s). The faculty member also sends copies to each participant at the oral evaluation.

* 1. After six (6) working days have passed since the oral evaluation, the Associate Dean for Administration sends the *Performance Evaluation* form, and the *Recommendation for Reappointment* form if applicable, along with written commentary and response, if any, to the Dean of Libraries.

**Retention of Documents**

1. The following documents are placed in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Libraries:

the *Position Description*~~,~~;

signed *Performance Evaluation* form;

signed *Apportionment Form*;

and for pre-tenure faculty, the *Recommendation for Reappointment* form and a copy of the Dean's recommendation for reappointment letter.

No copy is sent to the Vice-Chancellor's office or any other administrator's office. When a faculty member puts together his/her file for continuous appointment and/or promotion, the forms and letter do become part of that file for review by the Continuous Appointment and Promotion Committee (CAPC). The evaluations are sent to the Vice-Chancellor's office as part of the file in the Administrative Section.

1. All copies of the *Supervisory Performance Evaluation- Employee Input* forms are shredded by the Associate Dean for Administration three (3) months following the oral evaluation, unless a grievance is filed. In that case, the documents are retained until the situation is resolved.