This document is intended to guide chairs in their reviews with faculty, and clarify for faculty the expectations and responsibilities regarding the review process.

**Purpose of Periodic Reviews:**

It is the responsibility of both faculty and department chairs to ensure periodic reviews take place. These discussions (and letters) provide a regular, focused opportunity for the faculty member and the chair to discuss the faculty member's activities and programs related to the mission and strategic plan of the department, and to discuss plans for the future and potential changes in direction that may be desirable from the perspective of faculty program development, department curriculum or outreach program needs, or the faculty’s professional advancement.

Documentation of reviews is important for the eventual tenure and/or promotion dossiers for Assistant and Associate Professors; review letters are explicitly required in the dossiers. The review process provides an opportunity for the faculty member to receive guidance on trajectory toward promotion, and insight on any mid-course corrections that may be desirable. For Professors, reviews provide an opportunity for the chair to learn about the faculty member's programs, and for the faculty member to understand how his/her activities and efforts may contribute to the overall direction and program of the department. These reviews are also useful at all ranks in helping to inform the chair’s recommendations regarding salary improvement programs.

Expectations for timing of periodic reviews according to faculty rank are outlined below. Guidance on content of periodic review letters is provided as well.

**Assistant Professors**

1. Each non-tenured assistant professor must have a formal performance review by the Chair at least every twelve months. This includes a discussion followed by a written summary.

2. When the assistant professor is in his/her reappointment review year (normally the third year), the reappointment documentation will constitute the annual performance review for that year, and must include a discussion involving at least the faculty member and the chair, and a written letter from the chair to the faculty member (in addition to the dossier review process).

3. It is expected that the Chair will seek input and advice from the tenured faculty as appropriate before meeting with the faculty member being reviewed. Input from the mentoring committee is encouraged, although it should be remembered that the mentoring committee is not evaluative in nature; the mentoring committee may be particularly able to help structure advice for guiding the future focus of the faculty member.

4. Following the meeting between the Chair and the faculty member, a written summary of the evaluation shall be sent to the faculty member. One copy of the letter is to be signed by the faculty member, acknowledging receipt, and returned to the Chair. The faculty member may write a response letter if there are points of disagreement with statements made by the chair,
or if any important substantive information was omitted from the chair’s letter. It is recommended that the Chair’s letter encourage the faculty member to discuss any differences in perception immediately with the Chair, rather than relying only on the written reply.

5. A signed copy of each annual performance evaluation shall be sent to the Senior Associate Dean (electronically) after the evaluation is received and acknowledged by the faculty member.

6. Copies of any other substantive correspondence between the Chair and the faculty member being evaluated regarding the evaluation are to be sent to the Senior Associate Dean.

7. Copies of each annual review must be included in the documentation prepared for review for reappointment or for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Associate Professors

1. Every associate professor without tenure must have a formal performance review by the Chair at least every twelve months, following all of the steps above as for Assistant Professors.

2. Every associate professor with tenure must have a formal performance review by the Chair at least every second year in rank, involving a discussion and a written letter. Annual reviews are strongly encouraged, including at least a discussion which may be followed by a letter.

3. Performance reviews of associate professors with tenure (every second year in rank) shall consist of items 4 - 7 as for Assistant Professors, with item 3 (input from other faculty) optional, depending on the circumstances. These written review letters must be included in the documentation prepared for review for promotion to Professor. If annual reviews with a follow up letter are conducted, these letters should adhere to this process as well. (Letters are required every second year in rank.)

4. If the associate professor is in his/her promotion review year, the documentation and promotion process and associated discussions will constitute the performance review for that year.

Professors

1. Every Professor without tenure must have a formal performance review by the Chair at least every twelve months, following all of the steps above as for Assistant Professors.

2. Every Professor with tenure must have a formal performance review by the Chair at least every second year in rank, involving a discussion and a written letter. Annual reviews are strongly encouraged, including at least a discussion which may be followed by a letter.

3. Performance reviews of Professors with tenure (every second year in rank) shall consist of items 4 - 6 as for Assistant Professors. If annual reviews with a follow up letter are conducted, these letters should adhere to this process as well. (Letters are required every
second year in rank.) These letters may be brief, documenting the meeting and the general trajectory of the faculty member’s program. If changes in professional direction or effort, or substantive changes in responsibility, are agreed to at the meeting (e.g., change in courses taught), those topics should be documented in the letter.

Content of Letters

Letters from the chair to the faculty member serve to record the major topics of discussion at the periodic review meeting, and provide guidance to the faculty member regarding professional trajectory and changes to consider.

Letters to untenured faculty (any rank) and to tenured Associate Professors should include the following information:

- Date of meeting, and note others who participated, if any.
- Note briefly what background information or data were used to inform the discussion (e.g., CV, statement of research plans, teaching evaluations, etc.).
- State the current percent effort split among research, teaching, extension duties; if changes were made since the last review letter, note this.
- If agreement is made to pursue a change in effort distribution for the future, note this.
- If a reappointment, promotion, or tenure review is upcoming, note the pertinent dates by which the candidate needs to have materials/dossier turned in to the department. Reference the Sr. Associate Dean web site URL where the candidate can find current directions on these processes.
- As possible and appropriate, discuss how the faculty member followed up on the recommendations for change made at the last (annual) review meeting. What progress has been made? What is still left to be addressed from those previous recommendations?
- Discuss accomplishments and weaknesses (areas needing improvement) in each component of effort, citing (briefly) evidence to support the statements made in the letter. This discussion should include evaluative terms, such as “appropriate,” “strong,” “weak,” “sparse,” “outstanding,” “high-impact,” etc. It may be helpful to devote one paragraph to each area of effort. It is not enough to simply list facts, such as “You had 4 publications in 2008.” Include evaluative terms that convey a sense of whether this is a good trajectory and set of accomplishments or whether there are weaknesses.
- Include comments on working with undergraduate and graduate advisees as appropriate, either in a separate paragraph or in the “teaching” paragraph.
- Include comments (either in paragraphs above or as a stand-alone paragraph) on service contributions, such as department, college, university, or professional society committee service or leadership positions, service on scientific advisory or review boards, editorial boards, etc.
- If changes are suggested to faculty behavior or goals for any effort area, note them in each effort-specific paragraph as above, or in separate paragraphs. Try to be as clear as possible regarding what changes are suggested.
- Conclude with an overall evaluative statement regarding the faculty member’s contributions and accomplishments.
- Close with supportive comments about the faculty member’s role in the department, your willingness to work with him/her, etc.
• End the letter with the following:
This letter will become part of your permanent file and a copy will be sent to Senior Associate Dean (Max J. Pfeffer or Jan Nyrop). Please acknowledge your reading of this by signing below and noting if you will provide a letter in response (not required). Return this letter to me and I will see that you receive a copy. Thank you.

Sincerely,
(Chair name)
Professor and Chair

C: Senior Associate Dean (Max J. Pfeffer or Jan Nyrop)
File

I have reviewed this letter and

_____ will _____ will not be writing a response

_______________________________________
(Faculty Name)

Letters to tenured Full Professors may be much briefer than the above. They should include:

• Date of meeting, and note others who participated, if any.
• Note briefly what background information or data were used to inform the discussion (e.g., CV, statement of research plans, teaching evaluations, etc.).
• State the current percent effort split among research, teaching, extension duties; if changes were made since the last review letter, note this.
• If agreement is made to pursue a change in effort distribution for the future, note this.
• As pertinent, discuss how the candidate followed up on the recommendations for change made at the last review meeting (if any). What progress has been made? What is still left to be addressed from those previous recommendations?
• Note highlights in accomplishments or plans for teaching, research, extension, and service. This may be quite brief if positive. If negative or if changes are recommended, more detail should be included. See list above for suggestions and guidance on what to include.
• End the letter with the same wording as above, soliciting the faculty member's signature.