


January 21, 2010

TO: Executive Officers, Associate and Assistant Officers, Council of Deans,
Chairs and Directors

FROM: Warwick M. Bayly 
Provost and Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Annual Review 2009 – Faculty and Administrative Professional
Personnel

The evaluation of faculty and administrative professional personnel is a vital part of the administration of each area. Please share these instructions with all of those people for whom annual review is required. Distribution is important to prevent misunderstandings and to ensure that salary increases and promotions are made objectively, equitably, impartially, and as recognition of merit.

Annual review forms should be prepared for all permanent faculty and administrative professional employees who have not submitted a resignation (or a plan for retirement) effective for 2010. In addition, reviews should be completed for all temporary faculty and administrative professional employees, including those paid by grant funds (e.g., post docs), who would be eligible for salary increases if salary money were available and they were reappointed.

The period of this annual review is January 1, 2009, to December 31, 2009. The review is intended to address performance during a single calendar year. For **information on development officer annual review procedures and forms, contact the WSU Foundation at (509) 335-2073 or (509) 335-7954.**

Faculty members must use the new WORQS system (available under W in the A-Z index on the WSU home page or at <https://worqs.wsu.edu>) to prepare their annual reviews. WORQS provides a standardized format for them to submit their materials to their supervisors. Supervisors must still submit the annual reviews for their faculty members by hand to the deans. Electronic submission of these forms will be added to WORQS in the future.

Annual reviews should be done in a careful, systematic manner with special attention to the strengths and weaknesses of those under review. **There is no**

substitute for a thoughtful annual review as a guide to critical personnel decisions. The annual review should provide the basis for rewards. It also provides an opportunity to look forward, to agree on goals and objectives, and to reaffirm or redirect work assignments and activities.

The annual review is intended to provide feedback about the employee's performance **relative to the department's expectations.** The review should include an outline of principal duties and responsibilities and an evaluation of performance. Faculty are to be evaluated in terms of their performance in:

- 1) instruction and advising including # of graduate students mentored;
- 2) research and creative accomplishments;
- 3) service activities;
- 4) efforts related to promoting institutional interdisciplinary research;
- 5) issues relating to promotion of an effective workplace; and
- 6) such other criteria as are appropriate to the person's responsibilities and the functions of the unit.

Reference should be made to publications, student evaluations of teaching and any other indicators of performance. The review of administrators, deans, directors, and chairs must include evaluation of their performance in assuring equal employment opportunity, contributing to affirmative action and contributing to climate issues. The Faculty Manual now requires that any established instance of discrimination or sexual harassment must also be addressed in the annual review. Care should be taken to rate actual performance, rather than anticipated potential performance. The written review should not make predictions about the outcome of future promotion or tenure decisions.

Annual reviews are intended to reflect the direct supervisor and/or director/chair's assessments of the employee's performance and do not require input from other employees. However, the director/chair should solicit feedback from supervisors of employees at distant locations.

Merit ratings are defined as follows: A merit rating of 5 is to be used only when performance is truly outstanding. A merit rating of 4 indicates that the employee's performance exceeds expectations. A merit rating of 3 indicates **expectations have been met** (no matter how high those expectations may be). A rating of 2 suggests improvement is necessary. A rating of 1 is unsatisfactory. Ratings need not be in whole numbers, but distinctions should not be finer than 0.1. Supervisors should use most, or all, of the scale when assigning ratings.

The numerical rating and the written review should be consistent. This means that the comments should be evaluative and indicate relative quality, rather than simply catalogue activities. Reviews should provide an assessment of productivity, quality of work, and the employee's accomplishments relative to goals of his or her position and of the institution. **Evaluators are asked to include a section at the conclusion of the review which the faculty member and evaluator agree reflects reasonable goals for the faculty member in the coming year. It is expected that these goals will serve as the basis for the annual review, particularly with respect to scholarly and/or creative expectations, in the following year.**

The *Faculty Manual* requires that comparative feedback be provided to faculty in the form of the mean and standard deviation of the merit ratings for all faculty in the department or unit. However, no comparative information should be reported in departments having fewer than four faculty members on permanent appointment. This will preserve the confidentiality of ratings of individual faculty members.

Upon completion by the director/chair(s), the annual review shall be forwarded for approval to both the dean of the academic college or appropriate vice president and the campus Chancellor (if applicable). Again this must still be done manually, rather than electronically over the WORQS system. Each faculty member should also be given a copy of his or her completed annual review. The faculty member shall have a minimum of 2 working days to sign a statement indicating that he or she has read and has had the opportunity to discuss the report with his or her supervisor. Signing the review does not certify agreement with the substance of the review. A faculty member may append dissenting comments regarding the report's contents to the report. Within 15 working days of its receipt, each written statement so appended by a faculty member must receive a written acknowledgment that the statements have been reviewed by the immediate superior (normally the Dean[s]) of the evaluation writer (normally the Chair). All dissenting reviews are then forwarded through the Dean to the Office of the Provost. The writer of the dissent must also receive acknowledgment that the statement has been reviewed by the Provost and Executive Vice President within an additional 15 working days.

If the merit rating assigned by the faculty member's Dean is identical to that assigned by the Chair, no additional faculty signature is required. When the dean's rating differs from that of the chair, a second signature from the faculty member is required on the form.

Please note that if in any year no funds are allocated for salary increases, or if only a cost-of-living increase is available, the annual review reports will be retained and preserved at the department or equivalent administrative level for inclusion in the next year's reviews. At that time, the evaluations will be averaged and used to determine salary increases.

A second, Progress Toward Tenure Review, must also be performed yearly for each untenured tenure-track faculty member. This review should assess the faculty member's cumulative progress towards tenure. Progress Toward Tenure Reviews should be done at the same time of year as the annual review and they should usually lead logically to the final tenure decision. Similar to the annual review, the local supervisor should be consulted when reviewing the progress of faculty members at distant locations. The progress toward tenure review should also be written and be signed by both the chair and the faculty member. Again, the faculty member has the right to attach a response to the review. **Unlike the annual review, the progress towards tenure review is based on cumulative performance and requires the participation of all tenured faculty in the unit. The chair must also discuss the outcome of the review with the untenured faculty member.** More information on Progress Toward Tenure Reviews is available in the Faculty Manual Section III, http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/.

Annual Review Forms for Administrative Professional employees can be found in the Business Policy Procedures Manual 60.55. Administrative personnel may submit their materials to their supervisors over the WORQS system, but this is not required. Administrative Professional employees will be given a copy of the completed written evaluation and shall have a minimum of 5 working days to sign a statement that he or she has read the evaluation and has had the opportunity to discuss it with his or her supervisor. The employee may add comments that disagree with the contents of the annual review. Within 10 working days of receipt of either comments or dissent, the employee must receive written acknowledgement that the second line supervisor has reviewed the statements.

Reviews should be sent to Human Resource Services by **May 7, 2010**. All dissenting reviews are to be forwarded through the Dean to the Office of the Provost. **Note that an updated curriculum vitae or resume should be attached to each review.** These guidelines do not change the tenure review timeline or requirements.

cc: Budget Office
Human Resource Services

ANNUAL REVIEW FOR FACULTY
(January 1, 2009 – December 31, 2009)

NAME _____ WSU ID # _____

ACADEMIC _____ ANNUAL _____ 10 MONTH _____

YRS @ WSU _____ DEGREE _____ DEGREE YEAR _____

TITLE _____

PROGRAM _____ BUDGET _____ % SERVICE _____

DEPARTMENT _____

CHAIR MERIT RATING _____ DEAN MERIT RATING _____

UNIT MEAN/SD _____ CHANCELLOR MERIT RATING (when applicable) _____

.....

ANNUAL REVIEW STATEMENT:

DEPARTMENT CHAIR SIGNATURE DATE

EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE DATE

DEAN/DIRECTOR SIGNATURE DATE

CHANCELLOR SIGNATURE DATE

* Faculty member signature indicates that the employee has seen and had the opportunity to discuss this review. Faculty members may attach a response to this review.