



POLICY TITLE	Faculty Performance Evaluation and Feedback	Policy Number	633
Section	Academics	Approval Date	April 25, 2024
Subsection	Faculty	Effective Date	April 25, 2024
Responsible Office	Office of the Provost/Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs		

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 To foster excellence in teaching and to support the University’s educational mission, each full-time faculty member at Utah Valley University is comprehensively evaluated on teaching, scholarship/creative work, service, and compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations as conveyed by supervisory authorities in accordance with UVU and the Utah Board of Higher Education policies.

1.2 This policy establishes types of non-disciplinary supervisor feedback that can be used throughout the year, an annual goal-setting process, an annual review process, and processes for clarifications and appeals.

2.0 REFERENCES

2.1 *Duties and Responsibilities of the President of a Degree-granting Institution of Higher Education—Approval by Board of Trustees*, Utah Code § 53B-2-106.1

2.2 Utah Board of Higher Education Policy R481 *Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post-Tenure Review*

2.3 UVU Policy 165 *Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action*

2.4 UVU Policy 641 *Salaried Faculty Workload—Academic Year*

2.5 UVU Policy 648 *Faculty Personnel Reduction*

2.6 UVU Policy 649 *Faculty Remediation, Sanction, and Dismissal*

3.0 DEFINITIONS

3.1 Academic year: The Fall and Spring semesters combined.



3.2 Annual review reporting period: The annual review reporting period begins the first day of summer term each year and ends at the start of summer term the following year. Faculty who do not perform work for the University during the summer will report only on their work performed during the academic year.

3.3 Annual goal-setting template: A template supplied by Academic Affairs for use during the annual goal-setting process.

3.4 Annual review template: A template supplied by Academic Affairs for use during the annual review process.

3.5 Compliance: Adherence to policies and other written institutional expectations as conveyed by supervisory authorities per UVU and USHE policies.

3.6 Faculty addendum: An optional document submitted by the faculty member after the annual review meeting that asks questions about the supervisor's evaluation or that provides additional information or explanation regarding their performance.

3.7 Faculty member: For the purposes of this policy, the terms *faculty* and *faculty member* mean an employee hired into a full-time, benefits-eligible faculty position, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track (e.g., lecturer, appointment in residence, visiting faculty/scholar, or similar).

3.8 Notice of improvement needed (NOIN): A non-disciplinary type of feedback regarding a minor or first-time performance issue that includes a plan developed by a faculty member and their supervisor.

3.9 Performance: The faculty member's actions in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations as conveyed by supervisory authorities.

3.10 Professional Improvement Plan (PIP): A non-disciplinary type of feedback regarding a more serious or repeated minor performance issue that includes a plan developed by a faculty member and their supervisor.

3.11 Post-tenure review criteria: Program/department criteria used in a post-tenure review that describe the minimum performance requirements of a tenured faculty member.

3.12 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) criteria: Program/department criteria that establish expectations for teaching, scholarship/creative work, and service for the purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion.



3.13 Second-level supervisor: For a faculty member, the second-level supervisor is the dean or associate dean. For a department chair, the second-level supervisor is the Provost.

3.14 Self-evaluation: The portion of the annual review process completed by the faculty member in which they evaluate their performance in the previous annual review reporting period.

3.15 Supervisor: The direct or first-level supervisor of a faculty member. For most faculty, the supervisor is the department chair. If the faculty member is a department chair or was a department chair during the previous year, the dean or associate dean is the supervisor for the purpose of conducting the annual reviews.

3.16 Supervisor addendum: A document submitted by the supervisor in response to a faculty addendum which indicates whether the supervisor is making a change to their evaluation of the faculty member as a result of the faculty addendum.

3.17 Supervisor evaluation: The portion of the annual review process completed by the supervisor in which they evaluate the performance of the faculty member in the previous annual review reporting period.

4.0 POLICY

4.1 Policy Statement and Scope

4.1.1 This policy establishes the following:

4.1.1.1 Types of non-disciplinary supervisor feedback that can occur throughout the year and during the annual review process;

4.1.1.2 An annual goal-setting process that facilitates yearly faculty planning and supervisor guidance about those plans;

4.1.1.3 An annual review process in which the faculty member and supervisor formally evaluate faculty performance from the previous year in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations conveyed by supervisory authorities; and

4.1.1.4 Processes for clarifications and appeals.

4.2 Supervisor Feedback Levels

4.2.1 Supervisors may use three levels of non-disciplinary feedback for faculty members: guidance, notice of improvement needed (NOIN), and professional improvement plan (PIP).



4.2.1.1 *Guidance* is provided to faculty about how they can develop and improve professionally or, if they are already performing at an acceptable or high level, how they can maintain or enhance that level of performance. Supervisors must document guidance given as part of the annual goal-setting process.

4.2.1.2 *Notice of Improvement Needed* is used when a supervisor becomes aware of a minor or first-time performance issue for which a NOIN would be appropriate.

4.2.1.3 Professional Improvement Plan is used when a supervisor becomes aware of a more serious or repeated minor performance issue for which a PIP would be appropriate.

4.2.1.4

4.3 Annual Goal Setting Requirements

4.3.1 Faculty members create goals once a year for the upcoming annual review reporting period.

4.3.2 Faculty should set goals that will help them meet expectations and pursue meaningful activities and opportunities during the annual review reporting period. Goals should focus on high-stakes and high-level accomplishments that the faculty member intends to achieve. A strong starting point for defining high-stakes goals are the departmental RTP criteria and UVU policies.

4.3.3 Goals should incorporate feedback from supervisor, peers, students, and others with knowledge of the faculty member's performance. Goals may be modified during the year as needs change and opportunities arise. Faculty members may consult with their mentor, immediate supervisor, and the department RTP committee as they develop their annual goals.

4.3.4 If a faculty member holds administrative, professional, or other unique assignments during the annual review reporting period, those assignments should be included in their goals. Faculty members who have an appointment to two departments must submit their goals to both supervisors.

4.3.5 Supervisors must review and provide guidance regarding faculty member goals. When a faculty member modifies their goals, the supervisor will again be able to review and provide guidance on the modified goals. Supervisors will not be held responsible for the goals set by faculty members.

4.3.6 Faculty members will not be held responsible for their supervisor's failure to offer guidance on their goals, provided that the faculty member submitted their goals on time.



4.4 Annual Goal-Setting Template

4.4.1 Academic Affairs creates and maintains the annual goal-setting template. At a minimum, it contains the following: (1) a place for faculty members to set goals for teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance; (2) a place for the supervisor to provide guidance regarding those goals; (3) a place for faculty members to modify their goals during the annual review reporting period, if necessary; and (4) a place for the supervisor to provide guidance regarding modified goals. Supervisors and faculty members must use the annual goal-setting template.

4.4.2 The Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs Council, and relevant technological support staff shall be given the opportunity to provide input on the goal template each time Affairs considers revisions.

4.5 Annual Review Requirements

4.5.1 Consistent with the principles established in UVU Policy 641 *Salaried Faculty Workload—Academic Year*, expectations of a faculty member's performance correspond to their formally tracked and not formally tracked workload.

4.5.2 At a minimum, an annual review must address the following: (1) the expectation inferred from department/program RTP criteria for teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, and service as applicable, but reflecting what might reasonably be accomplished in a single year in light of the faculty member's workload; (2) compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations conveyed by supervisory authorities, and (3) the details specified in a NOIN or PIP, when such exist.

4.5.3 The supervisor is not expected to make findings or conclusions regarding faculty member compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations outside their purview. In these cases, the supervisor will rely on information from the appropriate office.

4.5.4 Faculty will not be held responsible for their supervisor's failure to complete the supervisor evaluation or conduct the annual review meeting, provided the faculty member submitted their self-evaluation on time and made themselves available for a meeting with the supervisor.

4.5.5 When the supervisor is a department chair, they may delegate preparation of the supervisor evaluation of faculty to an associate or assistant chair or to the faculty member's program coordinator. When the supervisor is a dean, they may delegate preparation of the written supervisor evaluation of faculty to an associate or assistant dean.

4.5.6 The supervisor and faculty member must meet to discuss the faculty member's performance in the previous year and their respective evaluations of the performance. A supervisor cannot delegate the annual review meeting. The individual who prepared the



evaluation should attend the meeting if the supervisor delegated that responsibility. Either the faculty member or the supervisor may request that Human Resources or Faculty Relations attend the meeting as support or document the proceedings of the meeting. This meeting should be in-person under normal circumstances. If special consideration is necessary for extenuating circumstances, such arrangements should be negotiated between faculty and supervisor in advance.

4.5.7 The annual review is included in the faculty personnel file.

4.6 Annual Review Rating Scale

4.6.1 Faculty performance in each of the annual review performance areas (teaching, scholarship/creative work, service, and compliance) is rated using one of five ratings:

4.6.1.1 *Does Not Meet Expectations*, which is used when a faculty member must significantly improve their performance to meet the expectations of their job. Faculty members whose performance warrants a PIP during any portion of an annual review period or who have a PIP during any portion of the annual review period must be given a Does Not Meet Expectations rating for the relevant area(s).

4.6.1.2 *Sometimes Meets Expectations*, which is used when a faculty member must improve their performance in order to meet the expectations of their job. Faculty members whose performance warrants a NOIN during any portion of an annual review period or who have a NOIN during any portion of the annual review period must be given a maximum rating of Sometimes Meets Expectations rating for the relevant area(s).

4.6.1.3 *Meets Expectations*, which is used when a faculty member consistently meets the expectations of their job and there are no areas of concern. Most faculty members at the University will receive a rating of Meets Expectations.

4.6.1.4 *Sometimes Exceeds Expectations*, which is used when a faculty member regularly exceeds the expectations of their job and there are no areas of concern.

4.6.1.5 *Exceeds Expectations*, which is used when a faculty member has consistently exceeded all expectations of their job by a significant margin and there are no areas of concern. This rating is reserved for a small minority of faculty and is used to highlight truly exceptional faculty performance.

4.7 Faculty Annual Review Template and Rubric

4.7.1 Academic Affairs creates and maintains the faculty annual review template. At a minimum, it contains the following: (1) a place for a faculty member's self-evaluation of their teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance; (2) a place for the



supervisor evaluation; (3) a place for addenda if needed; (4) a place for the second-level supervisor to sign off and provide written comments, if desired; and (5) a place for additional review if needed. Supervisors and faculty members must use the annual review template.

4.7.2 The Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs Council, and relevant technological support staff shall be given the opportunity to provide input on the annual review template each time Academic Affairs considers revisions.

4.7.3 At the discretion of the dean, a college/school may elect to use an annual review rubric as a supplement to department/program RTP criteria to (1) make more explicit the criteria by which faculty will be evaluated in their annual reviews and (2) ensure equality and fairness in the evaluation of faculty members across the college. If a dean does not choose to use an annual review rubric for the college/school, then departments, at the discretion of the department chair and faculty and in cooperation with the dean, may elect to use an annual review rubric as a supplement to the department/program RTP criteria. Annual review rubrics should be based on and consistent with relevant RTP criteria and must be compatible with the annual review template.

4.8 Post-Tenure Review

4.8.1 A post-tenure review shall be conducted by the Provost or designee and a committee of tenured faculty member peers, including at least two individuals appointed from either a different department or a different degree-granting institution than the tenured faculty member going through post-tenure review, or both. These committee members shall be appointed by the appropriate vice president at the degree-granting institution in consultation with the faculty member's department chair.

4.8.2 This post-tenure review shall consist of a comprehensive review of the tenured faculty member's performance over the previous five years. This review shall include an assessment of

4.8.2.1 teaching, including student evaluations, for all courses taught

4.8.2.2 the quality of the tenured faculty member's scholarly research

4.8.2.3 service to the profession, school, or community

4.8.2.4 annual performance reviews

4.8.2.5 intellectual property owned wholly or partly by, or commercialization efforts attributed to, the tenured faculty member

4.8.2.6 the tenured faculty member's compliance with the degree-granting institution's policies regarding the responsibilities and ethical obligations of faculty members, and



4.8.2.7 any improvement plans for underperformance

4.8.3 If, following a post-tenure review, the committee conducting the review determines that a tenured faculty member does not meet the standards established by the University, the department chair in collaboration with the faculty member shall create a remediation plan to address deficiencies and a timeline by which the tenured faculty member is expected to address the deficiencies. If the faculty member refuses to collaborate, the department chair creates the remediation plan as a directive.

4.8.4 A tenured faculty member who fails to address deficiencies as described in section 4.8.3 may be subject to disciplinary action by the University, including dismissal for cause, subject to the appeals process described in Policy 649 *Faculty Remediation, Sanction, and Dismissal*.

4.8.5 If the President, in consultation with the Board of Trustees, does not dismiss a tenured faculty member who fails to address deficiencies, the President shall justify in writing to the Board of Higher Education why the tenured faculty member is not being dismissed.

4.9 Annual Report to the Board of Higher Education

4.9.1 The President shall provide an annual report to the Board of Higher Education, no later than October 1 of each year, with the following information:

4.9.1.1 the number of post-tenure reviews that took place at the University in the previous year

4.9.1.2 an analysis of scores from post-tenure reviews that took place in the previous year with personal information redacted

4.9.1.3 the number of post-tenure reviews from the previous year that resulted in a remediation plan

4.9.1.4 a qualitative summary of the types of remediation plans created in the previous year, including an average timeline by which tenured faculty members are expected to address deficiencies, and

4.9.1.5 a summary of written justifications described in section 4.8.5, if any, with personal information redacted



5.0 PROCEDURES

5.1 Guidance Procedures and Timeline

5.1.1 Supervisors must give each faculty member guidance at least once a year during the annual goal-setting process. Guidance can be given during onboarding, when mentoring a faculty member, and at other times throughout the year.

5.2 NOIN and PIP Procedures and Timeline

5.2.1 When a faculty member falls short in performance on a minor or first-time issue (NOIN) or a more serious or repeated issue (PIP), the supervisor will inform them of the issue and begin the process of developing a NOIN or PIP with them to help them improve. The supervisor will inform the faculty member as soon as they become aware of an issue, regardless of whether the issue arises during the year or during the annual review process.

5.2.2 When a supervisor develops a NOIN or PIP with a faculty member, they are responsible for (1) clearly indicating how the faculty member is not meeting expectations; (2) establishing a plan with the faculty member to help them meet expectations; (3) offering reasonable resources or training for the faculty member if needed and consistent with established practices; (4) setting a timeline by which the faculty member must meet expectations that is as short as feasible but no longer than 12 months from the time the NOIN or PIP is finalized; and (5) identifying how the faculty member's performance will be documented for the duration of the NOIN or PIP.

5.2.3 After a supervisor informs a faculty member of an issue that warrants a NOIN or PIP, the collaborative process begins between the faculty member and the supervisor to develop the NOIN or PIP. If a faculty member is not collaborative or responsive, the supervisor can develop the NOIN or PIP and issue it as a directive.

5.2.4 NOINs and PIPs, when they exist, are included in the faculty personnel file and must be included in the annual review for the annual review period during which they were in effect.

5.2.5 When developing a NOIN or PIP, supervisors and faculty members should respond substantively to the other within two business days to ensure timely resolution.

NOIN and PIP Timeline	
NOIN – Total time to develop	20 business days
PIP – Total time to develop	40 business days

5.3 NOIN or PIP Appeal Timeline

5.3.1 A NOIN or PIP may be appealed via additional review.



5.3.2 If a faculty member requests an additional review at the conclusion of the process of developing the NOIN or PIP, an ad hoc committee will complete an evaluation appeal. The committee’s recommendation is then sent to the faculty member’s second-level supervisor to make the final decision. The outcome arrived at through this process of additional review is final. Both the ad hoc appeal report and the recommendation will be kept in the annual review file.

5.3.3 If the ad hoc committee determines that changes are to be made to the NOIN or PIP, the supervisor must complete the changes.

NOIN or PIP Appeal Timeline	
The ad hoc committee must render their decision	20 business days
If there are to be changes to the NOIN or PIP, the changes must be made	10 business days

5.4 Annual Goal-Setting Procedures and Timeline

5.4.1 Each faculty member sets goals for the upcoming annual review reporting period in accordance with the details set forth in this policy.

5.4.2 The supervisor reviews the faculty member’s goals and provides guidance on those goals in accordance with the details set forth in this policy.

5.4.3 Either the faculty member or supervisor can request a meeting to discuss the goals or guidance.

Annual Goal-Setting Timeline	
Faculty submit goals for the upcoming annual review reporting period.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The system opens for faculty on April 1. 2) Goals are due no later than September 15.
Supervisors review goals and provide guidance on goals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Supervisors can review goals and provide guidance as soon as faculty share their goals with the supervisor, beginning on April 1. 2) Supervisor review of goals and guidance must be completed no later than October 15.
Faculty can modify their goals at any time during the annual review reporting period. When they do so, the supervisor will be notified and should review and provide guidance about the modified goals in a timely manner.	



5.5 Annual Review Procedures and Timeline

5.5.1 Faculty members must provide a self-evaluation of their performance in the previous annual review reporting period. The self-evaluation includes a written component and a rating for each of the annual review performance areas.

5.5.2 If a faculty member holds administrative, professional, or other unique assignments during the annual review reporting period, those assignments shall be included in the self-evaluation. Faculty members who have an appointment to two departments must submit their self-evaluation to both supervisors.

5.5.3 Supervisors must provide a supervisor evaluation of faculty performance in the previous annual review reporting period. The supervisor evaluation includes a written component and a rating for each of the annual review performance areas.

5.5.4 The supervisor and faculty member must meet to discuss the faculty member’s performance in the previous year and their respective evaluations of the performance.

5.5.5 Second-level supervisors sign off on annual reviews before they are finalized and can provide written comments if desired.

Annual Review Timeline	
Faculty prepare and submit their self-evaluation.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The system opens for faculty on April 1. 2) Self-evaluations are due by May 30.
Supervisors prepare and submit the supervisor evaluation.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Supervisors can review self-evaluations and submit supervisor evaluations soon as faculty share their self-evaluations with the supervisor, beginning on April 1. 2) Supervisor evaluations are due by August 15.
Supervisors conduct annual review meetings.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) September 1 is the deadline for annual review meetings with faculty who are submitting midterm and tenure review portfolios on September 15. 2) November 30 is the deadline for annual review meetings with all faculty.
Second-level supervisors sign off on annual reviews and provide written comments, if desired.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Second-level supervisors can read annual reviews and provide comments as soon as the annual review meeting is conducted. 2) Second-level supervisor must read annual reviews and comments are due by December 15.



5.7 Addendum Procedures and Timeline

5.7.1 Annual reviews may be clarified via addendums and appealed via an additional review.

5.7.2 If a faculty member would like to ask questions about the supervisor’s evaluation or provide additional information or explanation regarding their performance, they may do so at any time before or during the annual review meeting. If a faculty member would still like to ask questions or provide additional information or explanation after the annual review meeting, they may do so via a faculty addendum.

5.7.3 If a faculty member submits an addendum, the supervisor must also submit an addendum. At a minimum, the supervisor addendum must contain a statement of whether the supervisor has changed anything about their evaluation of the faculty member as a result of the faculty addendum.

5.7.4 If a faculty member has completed the addendum process and believes that there is (1) an error of fact in their annual review or (2) an evaluation that is inconsistent with the RTP criteria or the annual review rubric (if one is in use), the faculty member can request an appeal review. An ad hoc committee will complete an evaluation appeal, and their recommendation is then sent to the faculty member’s second-level supervisor to make the final decision. Both the ad hoc appeal report and the recommendation will be kept in the annual review file. The outcome arrived at through this process of appeal review is final.

Annual Review Addendum and Appeal Timeline	
Deadline for a faculty addendum after the annual review meeting	10 business days
Deadline for a supervisor addendum after receiving a faculty addendum	10 business days
Deadline for a faculty member to appeal their annual review after receiving the supervisor addendum	10 business days
The ad hoc committee made by the Faculty Senate president in cooperation with Academic Affairs and the applicable Dean’s office must render their decision	20 business days
If there are to be changes to the annual review or supervisor addendum, the changes must be made	10 business days



UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

Policies and Procedures

POLICY HISTORY		
Date of Last Action	Action Taken	Authorizing Entity
June 22, 2017	New policy approved.	UVU Board of Trustees
March 31, 2022	Revised policy approved.	UVU Board of Trustees
April 25, 2024	Compliance change, mandated by HB 438, Utah Legislature, approved.	UVU President's Council
May 6, 2024	Compliance change ratified.	UVU Board of Trustees