



Office of  
Academic Affairs

## Guidelines and Instructions for Annual Performance Review

Annual performance reviews provide a measure of accountability for each faculty member. These reviews provide the opportunity to acknowledge an individual faculty member for a job well done, as well as a means for identifying areas of improvement and steps to improve performance. Annual reviews also provide information for use in salary recommendations and other assessments. To be most beneficial to the faculty member, these reviews should be candid and critical appraisals of the faculty member's work and should call attention to strengths as well as areas for improvement.

This document provides instructions and guidelines for the process used in evaluating the performance of each member of the faculty at least once each calendar year. All tenured and non-tenure track faculty will receive an annual performance review. Tenure track faculty may substitute the mid-probationary and tenure reviews for the annual performance review providing the annual performance evaluation can be differentiated from the multi-year review. Similarly, non-tenure track faculty with an appointment that leads to a fixed-term rolling contract may the review for a fixed-term rolling contract for the annual review, providing the evaluation of annual performance can be disaggregated from the comprehensive review.

Annual reviews for faculty will follow the general guidelines for all employees found in the Employee Handbook, including:

1. The annual performance evaluation is completed after the end of the calendar year.
2. The performance rating scale will include:
  - Exceptional (5): Performance far exceeds the job responsibilities and requirements.
  - Exceeds Expectations (4): Performance exceeds the job responsibilities and requirements.
  - Meets Expectations (3): Job responsibilities and requirements were successfully achieved, demonstrating complete position competency.
  - Almost Meets Expectations (2): Typically meets majority of the key requirements of the job, but occasionally falls below established limits. Fails to progress toward one or more targeted results.
  - Unsatisfactory (1): Fails to meet general requirements of the job and progress towards targeted results. Competency level is inadequate to satisfy requirements of this position.
3. Faculty may provide a response to their evaluation. However, performance evaluations are not subject to appeal.

All annual performance reviews for faculty will be conducted using the university's online platform, WyoFolio. It is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure that information in WyoVita is accurate, up-to-date, and consistent with college and university requirements. Unit heads are responsible for completing annual performance reviews in WyoFolio. Unit heads/supervisors should work with the designated staff in the Dean's Office to update job descriptions in WyoVita as needed.

### Guiding Principles

1. **Service to Mission:** The amount of effort (i.e., workload distribution) that faculty members, regardless of rank or position designation, devote to the various aspects of their duties necessarily varies, and any annual performance evaluation process should recognize these variations. A successful process considers whether the faculty member is effectively serving the mission of the university, as defined by university policy and college and/or academic unit criteria, the individual's job description, and the individual's agreed upon goals and objectives.
2. **Alignment between Job Description and Annual Evaluation.** The job description is an informative documentation of the faculty member's duties, activities, and responsibilities, along with the distribution of effort and any adjustments that are made to the faculty's workload from year to year. The annual review evaluation should be fair and impartial and should incorporate the unit's performance expectations and the allocation of effort outlined in each faculty member's job description.
3. **Consideration for Variance in Duties:** The efforts of any two faculty members may vary at the same points in their careers according to their particular strengths, as well as university, college and/or academic unit needs. Faculty assignments in different academic units will also vary. Expectations and assessment criteria should take into account these variances.
4. **Equitable Treatment:** To ensure equitable treatment, every faculty member will review and acknowledge the annual performance evaluation and job description for the following year as part of the Annual Performance Evaluation process. When determining the allocation of effort, decisions must be made without regard to race, national origin, gender, gender identity, age, disability, political beliefs, religion, marital status, sexual orientation, special friendships, or animus towards candidates. Further, administrators at all levels must understand and take an active role in avoiding institutional factors that could produce an undue burden, especially on untenured faculty members.

## Elements Included in Academic Units' Evaluation Policies and Procedures

To ensure consistency over time, academic units shall formalize their annual review policies and procedures by establishing a document that includes the following items. This document does not need to be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs, but it must be available upon request.

1. Statement of timeline for annual review.
2. Expectations and performance criteria for annual scholarship and creative activity, teaching, service, extension, outreach, community engagement, clinical/diagnostic activities, and other professional activities.
  - While faculty members' performance is evaluated through their contributions to these areas, leadership is an important component.
  - When applicable, leadership should be considered with regard to how it affects performance in one or more of the areas in the job description (e.g., how has leader impacted the teaching and research mission of their unit and college).
  - Expectations should be differentiated by rank within each faculty designation.
3. Guidelines that address when and how peer review is incorporated into the annual review process for the purpose of providing advice to the Unit Head for annual performance evaluation.
4. Procedures for each faculty member to meet with their Unit Head or comparable administrator annually regarding:
  - Performance for the previous year
  - Progress toward promotion, tenure and/or fixed-term as appropriate
  - Review and set goals
5. Process for each faculty member to respond to performance evaluation before it is formally submitted (e.g., inclusion of written statement in WyoFolio case file, request for peer review prior to the annual review being formally submitted, etc.)
6. Process for documenting that the department head held the Annual Performance Evaluation meeting with the faculty member (e.g., email to/from Department Head).  
Note: The performance evaluation at the unit level will not be considered final until the meeting has occurred and been documented in WyoFolio. Dean (or Director in units that do not have a Dean) review is required before the annual performance review is completed.

### Steps in Annual Review

The following procedures are involved in the annual performance review of faculty members. Within these general guidelines, the Unit Head is responsible for setting the unit schedule and ensuring that it meets college and university deadlines.

**Step 1 - Information Gathering.** The faculty member must upload required documents into his/her case file in WyoFolio by a deadline established by the academic unit or college and consistent with the university's annual review schedule for all employees.

The information gathered in this first step, and any other materials that may be deemed relevant, are utilized in the annual review. At minimum, materials must include an up-to-date CV, loaded from WyoVita, and a written statement that summarizes and provides self-reflection on performance in each of the areas outlined in the job description. Colleges and academic units may have additional requirements.

Consistent with the Standard Administrative Policy and Procedures (SAP) for Assessing Effective Teaching, evaluations of teaching should reflect the extent to which the instructor informed students about the subject matter, fostered skill development, and enhanced the development of educational goals. No single source of evidence can reasonably evaluate teaching effectiveness. Therefore, a body of evidence should be used, including but not limited to peer evaluations; supervisor evaluations; student surveys; teaching awards; participation in professional development; implementation of inclusive pedagogy and evidence-based techniques and strategies; and self-reflection, including assessment of student learning outcomes.

Note: the required frequency for assessing teaching effectiveness is outlined in the SAP. Unit heads shall ensure that these minimum standards are met in a timely manner.

**Step 2 – Unit Head Review.** The immediate administrative head/supervisor evaluates the faculty member on the basis of information provided by the faculty member, peer evaluators (if required by academic unit policy), students, and such other information as is available. Findings that the faculty member has engaged in professional or research misconduct may be addressed in the annual performance review. The unit head/supervisor then provides the faculty member with a preliminary written evaluation.

**Step 3 – Annual Review Meeting.** The administrative head/supervisor and faculty member meet no later than March 1, if possible, to discuss the written evaluation, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review, including any adjustments to the job description that may be needed for the following academic or fiscal year. The discussion at this meeting will also include a summary of the results of the evaluation conducted by a peer review committee, if required by unit policy.

If the faculty member is tenure- or fixed-term -eligible, this meeting should also include a discussion of the faculty member's progress toward tenure, fixed-term and/or promotion.

**Step 4 –Review of Evaluation Results.** As soon as possible after the annual review meeting, the final evaluation will be shared with the faculty member via WyoFolio. The faculty member provides comments as desired, acknowledges having seen the final written evaluation, and responds via WyoFolio within 72 business hours of the meeting described in step 3 above. The final written evaluation will become a part of the faculty member's academic unit records.

**Step 5 – Peer Review (if needed).** It is recommended that each academic unit clearly identify a unit peer review process that may be requested by a faculty member prior to their annual review being formally submitted (i.e., moved on to the Dean). If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation and requests peer review, he or she shall notify the immediate administrative head within 72 business hours of the meeting described in step 3 above.

If the faculty member does not notify the unit head by the deadline described in step 5, the faculty member will receive the original performance rating unless the administrative head determines that good cause exists for an exception.

**Step 6 – Moving Case Forward.** Upon completion of the unit level process, the Unit Head/Supervisor moves the case forward in WyoFolio (by clicking on "send case") for the next level of administrative review (typically by the Dean), who reviews the materials and completes the evaluation. Should he or she disagree with the results of the review, it may be referred back to the unit head for resolution. **DEANS MUST MOVE CASE FORWARD TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS NO LATER THAN END OF DAY ON MARCH 17, 2024.**

**Step 7 – Notification.** All faculty will receive a notification that the annual review has been completed and when the next review will occur. For tenure-track and fixed-term rolling contract track faculty in the probationary period, the notification letter will also include information about reappointment. Once the Provost and/or President approves the reviews, the Office of Academic Affairs will provide the notification letter to Deans and Directors for distribution.

#### **Administrative Considerations**

1. An annual performance review during the probationary period for faculty on a tenure track or fixed-term rolling contract track that results in a performance rating below “meets expectations” and a recommendation from the Unit Head/Supervisor or Dean to not reappoint shall be reviewed by the Provost. The Provost may request additional review by the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion committee and/or refer back to the unit and college for a full reappointment review.
2. When a faculty member holds an appointment that involves an administrative assignment (e.g., Unit Head), the related duties will be assessed by a supervising administrator (e.g., Dean). The supervising administrator may seek feedback on the faculty member’s teaching, research, and other service duties through academic unit procedures.

AY 24-25	Job Descriptions for all returning faculty must be submitted to College Interfolio Lead by <b>May 17, 2024</b> ; for new faculty by <b>September 6, 2024</b> . Colleges may have internal deadlines.
----------	--

Updated 11/20/2023

-----

Related Regulations, Policies and Forms: UW Regulation 2-1 (Academic Personnel), UW 2-4 (Guidelines for Establishing Academic Professionals), UW Regulation 2-9 (Faculty Workload Policy), UW Regulation 2-10 (Post-tenure Review)