



Requirements, Guidelines, and Procedures for Annual Reviews of Faculty

1. Requirements: Regulations and SAPs Governing Annual Reviews

Information governing annual reviews of faculty is found in several UW Regulations and UW SAPs. For convenience, the key sections of these regulations are extracted here. Subsequent sections of this document will provide additional guidance and specific procedures for conducting annual reviews of faculty.

1.1 Requirement for Annual Reviews of Faculty

The requirement for annual reviews of faculty is located in two UW Regulations. UW Regulation 2-7 Section IV.A. states: “With the exception [of] In-Residence, Adjunct, Visiting or Emeritus Faculty, all academic personnel, regardless of rank, tenure status or fixed-term status, shall be reviewed annually by the Academic Unit head and approved by the Dean in accordance with guidelines and procedures established by the Office of Academic Affairs as well as the unit and college.”

UW Regulation 2-9 Section V states: “In accordance with University policies, review procedures shall be implemented annually to evaluate each faculty member's performance and responsibilities with respect to the workload outlined in the Job Description and to determine if adjustments should be made for the following year.”

1.2 Definitions of Annual Review

Annual review is defined in one UW Regulation and one UW SAP. According to UW Regulation 2-10 Section II, annual review is defined as: “A formal discussion between the Unit Head and faculty member about the individual’s professional development and performance. The basis for this review is an annual performance evaluation carried out by the Unit Head to evaluate the past year’s performance and to review progress and achievement of goals. The annual evaluation of the faculty member is conducted by the Unit Head and is based on performance in each of the duties outlined in the faculty member’s job description. A consensus of the faculty of the Academic Unit shall determine when and how peer review is incorporated into the Annual Review process for the purpose of providing advice to the Unit Head.”

A shorter definition is provided in UW SAP 2-7.2 Section II:

“Annual Performance Review or Annual Review: A review conducted once per year on all academic personnel, regardless of rank, tenure status or fixed-term status, by their Academic Unit Head and approved by their Dean.”

1.3. Requirement for Unit Annual Review Guidelines

UW does not provide specific, unit-level review guidelines to be used by academic units. Instead, two UW Regulations and one SAP explicitly delegate the development of these review

guidelines to the academic units. UW Regulation 2-7 Section IV.A. states: “To ensure consistency over time, each Academic Unit shall publish its annual review guidelines. The guidelines shall address when and how peer review is incorporated into the annual review process for the purpose of providing advice to the Academic Unit head for annual performance evaluation. Annual review guidelines for the units shall be approved by the respective Dean (or Director of college-like unit) and shall be reviewed by the Vice Provost for consistency with University Regulations and Standard Administrative Policies and Procedures.”

In its definition of an annual review (noted above in Section 1.2) UW Regulation 2-10 Section II, states: “A consensus of the faculty of the Academic Unit shall determine when and how peer review is incorporated into the Annual Review process for the purpose of providing advice to the Unit Head.”

UW SAP 2-7.1 Section IV.A states: “In each academic unit, criteria for assessing performance in the annual review will be established by academic unit faculty and approved by the Unit Head, Dean or Director and Provost. Performance ratings shall range from “far exceeds expectations, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, unacceptable.” Criteria for each of the five levels of performance shall be established for teaching/support of education, research/scholarship/creative activities, service/outreach, extension, advising, and/or other assigned responsibilities.”

1.4. Applicability of UW Regulations and SAPs

There is no single UW Regulation or SAP that provides guidance for the annual reviews of faculty. Instead, the language about annual reviews is distributed among documents that otherwise address different issues and faculty designations. Academic Affairs has determined that this language will apply to all academic personnel (as defined in UW Regulation 2-1), with the exception called out in UW Regulation 2-7 of “In-Residence, Adjunct, Visiting or Emeritus Faculty.” (as noted above in Section 1.1).

2. **Guidelines for Conducting Annual Reviews**

Annual reviews for faculty will be conducted in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Annual reviews will examine the performance of faculty members during the calendar year. Academic Affairs recognizes that faculty job descriptions and workloads are typically prepared on an academic year or fiscal year basis but uses the calendar year basis for annual reviews to be consistent with the review cycle for non-academic personnel.
2. Annual reviews will be completed during the first quarter of the calendar year following the year to be reviewed.
3. The probationary reviews for tenure-track faculty, the fixed-term rolling contract (FTRC) reviews for FTRC-track faculty, the tenure and promotion reviews for tenure-track faculty, and the promotion reviews for all faculty may be substituted for the annual review providing the annual performance evaluation can be differentiated from the multi-year review.
4. Goals only reviews may be conducted for all faculty hired on or after October 1 of the year to be reviewed.

5. The following five-level rating scale will be used to evaluate each component of a faculty member's job description and their overall performance:
 - Exceptional: Performance far exceeds the job responsibilities and requirements. This is equivalent to "*Far Exceeds Expectations*" in UW SAP 2-7.1.
 - Exceeds Expectations: Performance exceeds the job responsibilities and requirements. This is equivalent to "*Exceeds Expectations*" in UW SAP 2-7.1.
 - Meets Expectations: Job responsibilities and requirements were successfully achieved, demonstrating complete position competency. This is equivalent to "*Meets Expectations*" in UW SAP 2-7.1.
 - Below Expectations: Meets many of the key requirements of the job but not all. This is equivalent to "*Needs Improvement*" in UW SAP 2-7.1.
 - Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet many requirements of the job. This is equivalent to "*Unacceptable*" in UW SAP 2-7.1.
6. Faculty performance, while evaluated on a five-level scale, is not converted to a numerical rating.
7. Faculty annual reviews will be conducted using the WyoFolio platform. Faculty members are responsible to ensure that information in WyoVita is accurate, up-to-date, and consistent with college and university requirements.
8. Unit heads are responsible for completing annual performance reviews in WyoFolio. Unit heads/supervisors should work with the designated staff in their college or higher level unit office to update job descriptions in WyoVita as needed.
9. Faculty "shall have the opportunity to review and provide a response [to their evaluation] that will be included in the personnel file and the [WyoFolio] case file" (UW SAP 7-2.1 Section IV.D)
10. Annual performance reviews are not subject to appeal (UW Regulation 2-2 Section II.A). Instead "The Academic Employee may submit a written statement to the applicable dean or director. The statement will be added to the Academic Employee's personnel file."

3. Elements Included in Academic Units' Evaluation Policies and Procedures

To ensure consistency over time and as required by UW Regulation and SAP, academic units shall formalize their annual review policies and procedures. While the document containing this information need not be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs, such submission is encouraged and recommended. The document formalizing unit-level policies and procedures may be part of the academic unit's bylaws or may be separate. It should include the following items:

1. The timeline for annual reviews in the academic unit (the deadline for annual reviews to be completed and submitted to Academic Affairs will be set by Academic Affairs and is typically March 15 for reviews examining the prior calendar year's performance.)
2. Expectations and performance criteria for teaching, scholarship, research and creative activity, service, extension, outreach, community engagement, clinical/diagnostic activities, and other professional activities. Expectations for leadership may also be included.
3. Expectations should be differentiated by faculty designation and rank.

4. Guidelines that address if, 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.
5. Other items as determined by the academic unit.

4. Steps in Annual Review

The Unit Head, following the timeline developed by the academic unit, is responsible for finalizing the unit's annual review schedule to accomplish the following steps and ensure that college and university deadlines are met.

4.1 Step 1 – Information Gathering

The faculty member must upload required documents into their case file in WyoFolio by the 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, including the addition of previous annual reviews.

Consistent with UW Regulation 2-5, UW SAP 2-5.1, and UW SAP 2-7.3, 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.

UW SAP 2-5.1 Section IV provides the required frequency for assessing teaching effectiveness. UW SAP 2-5.1 Sections V.A and V.B specify that units and colleges shall develop guidelines for assessing teaching effectiveness.

4.2 Step 2 – Unit Head Review

4.2.1 *Appointment in One Unit*

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 prepares a preliminary written evaluation to be shared with the faculty member.

4.2.2 *Joint Appointment in More Than One Unit*

When a faculty member has a joint appointment in two academic units, at a minimum the secondary unit head (of the unit with the lower percentage appointment) should submit a letter of

evaluation into the faculty member's case file in WyoFolio before it is reviewed by the primary unit head (of the unit with the higher percentage appointment). Additional procedures may be documented in memoranda of understanding/agreement between the units, and in the primary and secondary department annual review protocols.

4.3 Step 3 – Annual Review Meeting with Unit Head/Supervisor

The unit head/supervisor and faculty member should meet no later than March 1 to discuss the preliminary written evaluation. 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 pre-tenure or fixed-term rolling contract-eligible, this meeting should also include a discussion of the faculty member's progress toward tenure or fixed-term rolling contract.

This meeting is also an excellent time for the unit head/supervisor and the faculty member to discuss the future, especially the job description for the upcoming academic or fiscal year. Additionally, this meeting can be used to discuss progress toward promotion.

4.4 Step 4 – Review of Unit Head/Supervisor Evaluation Results

After the annual review meeting, the unit head/supervisor will finalize the written evaluation and this final evaluation will be shared with the faculty member via WyoFolio. Within 72 hours of receiving the final evaluation, the faculty member acknowledges having seen it via WyoFolio. Additionally, the faculty member may provide comments with their acknowledgement as allowed by UW SAP 7-2.1 Section IV.D which states the faculty members “shall have the opportunity to review and provide a response [to their evaluation] that will be included in the personnel file and the [WyoFolio] case file”. The final written evaluation will become a part of the faculty member's academic unit records.

4.5 Step 5 – Higher Level Review

Upon completion of the unit level process, the unit head/supervisor (or primary unit head in the case of a joint appointment) 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 their evaluation. Should they disagree with the unit head/supervisor review, they may refer it back to the unit head/supervisor for resolution. When there is a joint appointment, unless otherwise documented in memoranda of understanding/agreement or other agreements, the Dean of the secondary unit will not directly receive the case in WyoFolio.

4.6 Step 6 – Acknowledgement of Higher Level Review

Within 72 hours of receiving the evaluation from the higher level reviewer, the faculty member acknowledges having seen it via WyoFolio. Additionally, the faculty member may provide comments with their acknowledgement as allowed by UW SAP 7-2.1 Section IV.D which states the faculty members “shall have the opportunity to review and provide a response [to their evaluation] that will be included in the personnel file and the [WyoFolio] case file”. The final written evaluation will become a part of the faculty member's academic unit records.

4.7 Step 7 – Move Case to Academic Affairs

The fully completed case, including evaluations and faculty acknowledgements, must be submitted to Academic Affairs. The deadline for this submission will be set by Academic Affairs annually and will typically be on or near March 15.

4.8 Step 8 – Notification

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

5. **Administrative Considerations**

5.1 Tenured Faculty Who Are Below Expectations

Tenured faculty who receive a rating of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” *in any one component* of their job description *or overall* will be subject to the provisions of UW Regulation 2-10. The specific actions to be taken are spelled out in that regulation and depend on several factors. Refer to that regulation for the specific details.

5.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty With 3- or 5-Year FTRCs Who Are Below Expectations

Non-tenure track faculty with 3- or 5-year FTRCs who receive a rating of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” on their *overall* performance will be subject to the provisions of UW Regulation 2-7 and UW SAP 2-7.1. The specific actions to be taken are spelled out in these documents. Typically, the FTRC will be suspended but additional actions are available as indicated in the SAP.

5.3 FTRC-Track Faculty in the Probationary Period Who Are Below Expectations

An annual review of an FTRC-track faculty member in their probationary period (has not received an FTRC) that provides a rating of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” *in any one* or more component(s) of the job description but *nevertheless recommends reappointment* “shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit criteria.” (UW SAP 2-7.1 Section IV.F).

FTRC-track faculty in their probationary period who receive a rating of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” in any one component of their job description must prepare a written plan for improvement in conjunction with their unit head/supervisor within one month of completion of their annual review process (as per UW SAP 2-7.1 Section IV.G). This plan must be submitted to the dean or director for approval.

An annual review of an FTRC-track faculty member in their probationary period which results in a recommendation from the unit head/supervisor and/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.” (UW SAP 2-7.1 Section IV.E) In these situations, the Provost may also refer the case back to the unit and college for a full, multi-level reappointment review.

5.4 Tenure-Track Faculty in the Probationary Period Who Are Below Expectations

Tenure-track faculty who receive a rating of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” in any one component of their job description but “Meets Expectations” overall are not required to follow the provisions of UW Regulation 2-10 or the provisions of UW SAP 2-7.1 Section IV.G. Nevertheless, the development of a performance improvement agreement (PIA as defined in UW Regulation 2-10) or a written plan for improvement (as defined in UW SAP 2-7.1 Section IV.G) is considered best practice and is recommended by Academic Affairs. This allows clear communication between the tenure-track faculty member and their unit head/supervisor of steps to be taken to improve performance.

Tenure-track faculty who receive a rating of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” overall and a recommendation from the unit head/supervisor or dean to not reappoint will be subject to the provisions of UW SAP 2-7.1 Section IV.E. Specifically, their annual review “shall be reviewed by the Provost. The Provost may request additional review by the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee.” In these situations, the Provost may also refer the case back to the unit and college for a full, multi-level reappointment review.

5.5 Faculty Who Hold an Administrative Appointment

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.

6. **Feedback to Academic Affairs**

In the event that this document does not address a specific situation, or if some component of the guidance in this document is found to be confusing, please contact Faculty Affairs at facultyaffairs@uwyo.edu. The Office of Academic Affairs is committed to continuous improvement of its administrative processes and welcomes this feedback.

7. **References**

- UW Regulation 2-1 *Academic Personnel* (Revisions adopted 10/14/2020)
- UW Regulation 2-2 *Academic Personnel Dispute Resolution* (Revisions adopted 5/14/2020)
- UW Regulation 2-5 *Assessing Effective Teaching* (Revisions adopted 5/11/2023)
- UW SAP 2-5.1 *Procedures for Assessing Effective Teaching* (Approved 7/21/2023)
- UW Regulation 2-7 *Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Fixed-Term* (Revisions adopted 5/11/2023)
- UW SAP 2-7.1 *Procedures for Implementing and Evaluating Rolling Contracts* (Approved 4/28/2023)
- UW SAP 2-7.2 *Procedures for Conducting Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Reviews for Tenure-Stream Faculty* (Approved 6/26/2023)
- UW SAP 2-7.3 *Criteria and Sources of Information for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion* (Approved 11/6/2023)
- UW Regulation 2-9 *Faculty Workload* (Revisions adopted 11/14/2009)
- UW Regulation 2-10 *Post-Tenure Review* (Revisions adopted 3/25/2021)