

October 2011

## 5.305 Core Faculty Contracts, Development Plans and Evaluations

Follow this and additional works at: [http://aura.antioch.edu/policies\\_500\\_3x](http://aura.antioch.edu/policies_500_3x)

---

### Recommended Citation

"5.305 Core Faculty Contracts, Development Plans and Evaluations" (2011). *5.300 Faculty Employment at the University*. 5.  
[http://aura.antioch.edu/policies\\_500\\_3x/5](http://aura.antioch.edu/policies_500_3x/5)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the 5.000 Academic Policies at AURA - Antioch University Repository and Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in 5.300 Faculty Employment at the University by an authorized administrator of AURA - Antioch University Repository and Archive. For more information, please contact [dpenrose@antioch.edu](mailto:dpenrose@antioch.edu), [wmcgrath@antioch.edu](mailto:wmcgrath@antioch.edu).



Type of Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>University</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Campus</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Department/Unit</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Interim</i>		<b>Core Faculty Contracts, Development Plans, and Evaluations</b>  <b>Policy 5.305</b>	
<b>Academic Policies</b>		Effective date: <b>May 1, 2012</b>	
<b>Policy History:</b>	<b>Approved by:</b>	<b>Resolution #</b>	<b>Date</b>
Approved	Board of Governors	11.6.10:11	November 6, 2010
Revised	Chancellor	N/A	June 1, 2011
Revised:	Chancellor	N/A	May 1, 2012
Revised (Non-substantive)	Office of University Counsel	N/A	May 19, 2017
<b>Responsible Office</b>	<b>Responsible Administrator:</b>	<b>Contact information</b>	<b>Applies to:</b>
Office of Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs	Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs	937-769-1890	All Core Faculty

## I. Introduction

### A. Purpose

It is the policy of Antioch University to attract and employ highly qualified, dedicated and diverse faculty who are able to achieve the University’s commitment to rigorous education, innovative experiential learning and socially engaged citizenship. To that end, it is further the policy of the University to encourage and promote instructional skills, scholarship, service and professional growth of such faculty throughout their careers at the University. Faculty contracts and evaluations are integral to achieving that purpose. Therefore, the purpose of this policy is to define the nature and duration of Core Faculty appointments and the general terms of the faculty development and evaluation processes which will be used to administer and support such appointments.

### B. Application

This policy applies to “Core Faculty”, who are defined in the University’s Faculty Personnel Policies as those faculty who have responsibility for engaging all four areas of faculty responsibility including engagement with student learning, scholarship, service and institutional citizenship. Therefore, this policy does not apply to visiting, adjunct, affiliate, teaching, public service, research, and clinical faculty, and any other faculty who do not

meet the definition of “Core Faculty.” Unless specifically differentiated, these policies apply to all Core Faculty, regardless of organizational or academic unit.

## **II. Types of Core Faculty Contracts**

### **A. Initial Appointments Core**

Faculty will initially be hired for a fixed term of two years and, and assuming satisfactory performance in annual reviews during the first fixed term and further assuming that the faculty member’s contract has not otherwise been terminated for reasons of programmatic changes or budget curtailment, then a second two-year fixed term contract shall be offered, (collectively the “Initial Appointment Period”). During this Initial Appointment Period, if the Core Faculty member’s contract will not be renewed, notice shall be provided within the time provided for in the faculty non-renewal policy. During the terminal year, the **University** may either continue to assign work to the Core Faculty member or provide severance pay equal to his/her annual salary in lieu thereof.

1. **Accelerated Appointments** In exceptional cases, a Provost, upon recommendation from the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) of such campus or program, may request of the Chancellor an acceleration or waiver of the Initial Appointment Period so as to permit the early issuance of a three-year rolling appointment. Such exceptions shall be rare and shall be based on objective considerations of the needs of the University, and the experience, expertise and contribution of the Core Faculty member. Ordinarily, such requests would be considered only after the faculty member has completed two years of employment with the University and completed a minimum of four years or more of academic appointments here or elsewhere. Any such acceleration is completely discretionary on the part of the Chancellor and shall not be the subject of a grievance or appeal

### **B. Rolling Three-Year Appointments**

Core Faculty who have been employed for four years or more shall be employed on rolling three-year appointments. Assuming continued satisfactory performance in the annual performance reviews, and further assuming that the faculty member’s contract has not otherwise been terminated for reasons of programmatic changes or budget curtailment, the appointment shall be renewed each year with successive three-year appointments. In the event of an unsatisfactory annual evaluation as described below, the three-year appointment shall not be automatically renewed and the faculty member will begin year two of the three-year contract with the opportunity to demonstrate improved performance.

Assuming that the faculty member can demonstrate satisfactory performance in year two of the three-year appointment, the contract will renew the following year with a new three-year appointment. However, if the faculty member is unable to demonstrate satisfactory performance in year two of the appointment, notice of non-renewal shall be issued in accordance with the Faculty Non-renewal policy. The faculty member will then

have one terminal year remaining on the three-year appointment after which his/her employment as a Core Faculty member shall end. During the terminal year, the University may either continue to assign work to the Core Faculty member or provide severance pay equal to his/her annual salary in lieu thereof.

### **1. Faculty Development Plan and Review Cycles**

As discussed more fully below, three-year rolling appointments shall include a Faculty Development Plan and Review process. Because the simultaneous implementation of the three-year rolling appointments with respect to current faculty may result in current Core Faculty members having their five-year faculty development Plan and Review on the same calendar cycle, the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) of each campus or program, will work with the unit heads to devise a staggered 5-year review cycle, which can take into account upcoming retirements, program developments and the like. Those Core Faculty who have expressed an intent to retire within the first five-year period after implementation of three-year rolling appointments, shall not be required to undergo a Faculty Development Plan and Review unless they subsequently extend their anticipated retirement date. By July 1, 2016 all employees who have entered three-year rolling appointments in this transition must have on file a five-year development plan. The final staggered plan must be approved by the campus Provost.

## **III. Evaluation of Core Faculty**

### **A. Purpose**

The purpose of the University performance review system is to encourage high quality teaching and learning, and to promote faculty professional development and public accountability. The evaluation of Core Faculty shall include the following forms of review, each with a distinct purpose:

1. Annual Performance Review
2. Five-year Faculty Development Plan and Review (required review for faculty completing a Five-year Development Plan)
3. Appointment Review (triggered only if performance problems arise)
4. Advancement Review (elective review for advancement in faculty rank or pay)

## **IV. Timing and Nature: Required Performance Reviews and Faculty Development Plan Review**

### **A. Annual Performance Review**

The Annual Performance Review, as the name suggests, shall be completed each academic year. It serves both developmental and accountability purposes. A satisfactory annual review triggers, depending on the type of the faculty member's then current contract, the renewal of an initial appointment, the issuance of the first three-year rolling appointment, or the renewal of a successor three-year rolling contracts. The Annual Performance Review will include a self-assessment by the faculty member, supported with appropriate evidence, followed by the unit head's evaluation. The Annual Performance Review shall provide evidence of achievement of work goals, including (1) those from the Core Faculty member's five-year development plan; (2) performance goals for the upcoming year developed in the context of the unit and (3) demonstrate achievement in the four major categories of faculty responsibility as follows:

#### **1. Engagement in Student Learning**

Student learning is measured by evidence of both the quality and quantity of engagement with students including course-based and non-course-based learning, advising, supervising, chairing and participating in theses and dissertation committees and the like. For Core Library Faculty, student learning is measured by evidence of both the quality and quantity of engagement with students including course-based and non-course-based learning, individual consultations, reference, classroom and other group instruction, academic reader's advisory, as well as other activities in support of student learning. All Antioch Core Faculty are expected to meet or exceed expectations in student learning.

#### **2. Engagement with Scholarship**

The University encourages professional growth and scholarship among its faculty. "Scholarship" is commonly understood to include four categories as defined by the Rice/Boyer model: discovery, integration, application (now called "practice"), and teaching. In each case, scholarship (1) leads to the creation of new knowledge, (2) is publicly available in some way, (3) is presented and shared with a community of scholars, and (4) enriches knowledge and practice in the discipline or professional practice. The University endorses this model and, consequently, if professional work lacks one or more of these criteria, the work does not satisfy the scholarship category and should be classified as professional service.

#### **3. Engagement in Service (external service)**

The University further encourages service by its faculty to the community. "Service" refers to service to the professional community and to the general community; service to the institution is a separate category (Institutional Citizenship). Service to the profession is achieved by carrying out responsibilities, usually but not necessarily related to one's area of expertise in professional organizations or the general community. Service to the general community is achieved through service that brings one's area of expertise to the service of others outside the University, including the local or global community.

#### **4. Engagement with Institutional Citizenship (internal service)**

Service to the institution is defined as carrying out non-teaching responsibilities not necessarily related to one's area of expertise or even academic in nature that contribute the operations of Antioch University – unit, campus, and larger institution.

#### **B. “Satisfactory” Performance Defined.**

Antioch University core faculty members are expected to meet or exceed expectations in all four categories of faculty work. A “satisfactory” annual review means:

1. ‘meets or exceeds expectations’ in the category of engagement in student learning; and
2. ‘meets or exceeds expectations’ in any two of the other three categories of faculty work; and
3. has not been judged as ‘not meeting expectations’ in a single category, other than student learning, for two consecutive years.

#### **C. “Unsatisfactory” Performance Defined.**

An “unsatisfactory” annual performance review means the core faculty member received one of the following three evaluations:

1. ‘does not meet expectations’ in the category of engagement in student learning; or
2. ‘does not meet expectations’ in any two of the other three categories of faculty work; or

‘does not meet expectations’ in a single category on the performance evaluations for two consecutive years.

#### **D. Five-Year Faculty Development Plan and Review**

1. The purpose of the Five-year Faculty Development Plan and Review (“Five-year Review”) is primarily developmental, to provide meaningful, effective peer evaluation to recognize and improve performance for Core Faculty who have satisfactory or better Annual Reviews. The Review should look back at the past Five-year Plan (“Plan”), if any, and provide evidence for its progress or achievements. The Review shall also develop and affirm a Plan for the next five years .with greater specificity in the first three years of the proposed plan than in the latter two. The Plan must be substantive and address growth in at least one of the four categories of faculty work. The Plan should include redressing any areas of remediation which appeared as concerns in Annual Reviews and should include measurable goals toward that growth in each of the five years. The Plan will include

a request for a six month learning or scholarship leave with specific goals and measurable outcomes. Typically this leave may not be awarded until the third or later year of a five-year cycle, although exceptions can be made based on the purpose of the leave, faculty performance, and unit capacity.

2. For Core Library Faculty, learning or scholarship leaves will be the equivalent of 6 months of leave over each 5-year period, with each increment being no less than one month.

3. Review of the faculty member's Plan shall be conducted by a Faculty Peer Review Committee following guidelines established by the University Academic Council ("UAC") and approved by the University Leadership Council ("ULC"). Final approval of the Plan shall be by the Chief Academic Officer ("CAO") receiving peer review. Establishment of the timeline for leaves shall be set by the unit head in consultation with the CAO.

4. Each year of the 5-year plan, the faculty member shall provide the Unit Head and CAO with an update on goal accomplishment. Substantive progress on goals must be made for the academic leave to be granted. Academic leaves will typically not be granted until the third year or later of a five-year plan.

#### **E. Appointment Review**

1. The Appointment Review is triggered when, in the previous review year, a faculty member does not achieve a rating of "satisfactory" or better in all four categories of faculty responsibility or fails to demonstrate evidence of progress on the Five-year Development Plan. In that event, the three-year rolling contract is not renewed and two years remain on the appointment. The Appointment Review will occur in the second year of a three-year appointment.

2. Prior to August 31 of the year following an unsatisfactory evaluation, the appropriate Unit Head shall develop a performance improvement plan (PIP), with the faculty member, which addresses the faculty member's performance deficiencies and recommended actions for improvement and shall submit such PIP to the CAO for review and approval. Both the Unit Head and an Appointment Review Committee constituted by the CAO, shall provide recommendations to the CAO regarding the development of the PIP and their later evaluation of progress on the PIP in accordance with procedures adopted by the ULC. Final approval of the PIP shall rest with CAO.

3. If after the Appointment Review the faculty member does not receive a satisfactory rating or better in all four categories of faculty responsibility or in the goals established by the PIP, notice of non-renewal shall be issued in accordance with the Faculty Non-renewal policy. Final approval of the decision resulting from the Appointment Review shall rest with the Provost.

## **F. Advancement Review**

An Advancement Review is an elective process for Core Faculty on Three-Year Rolling Appointments to secure advancement in rank (if possible) and/or merit increase. Review of the faculty member's Advancement portfolio shall be conducted by the Faculty Peer Review Committee following procedures established by the ULC. Final approval of advancement in rank or pay shall be by the Provost upon the Faculty Peer Review Committee recommendation to the CAO and the CAO recommendation to the Provost. Core Faculty who elect an Advancement Review may do so at such time that they feel prepared, but advancement may not occur more frequently than every five years. In the event that the advancement of rank or pay is denied, the faculty member may reapply upon achievement of the specific criteria for re-application set forth by the Faculty Peer Review Committee.