MEMORANDUM

TO: Chancellors, Deans, Vice Chancellors, Associate Deans, Chairs, and Directors
FROM: Daniel J. Bernardo, Provost and Executive Vice President
SUBJECT: 2017 Faculty and Staff Annual Reviews (Revised)
DATE: January 3, 2018

The new annual review process, effective January 1, 2018 and pertaining to 2017 annual reviews, provides a simplified process that combines annual reviews, progress toward tenure and third-year reviews. Simultaneously, we are implementing a new faculty reporting system, Activity Insight, to be used by all faculty in submitting their annual review information.

Below please find detailed information regarding the new abridged, comprehensive, and intensive reviews. **Distribution of this memorandum is important to prevent misunderstandings and to ensure promotions are made objectively, equitably, and impartially.**

**Abridged Review (New short-form annual review)**
The abridged review is conducted every other year for tenured and non-tenure track faculty making satisfactory progress. The faculty member will need to submit an updated Activity Insight report, updated curriculum vitae, as well as a short description of accomplishments since their last review.

The review is performed by the department chair/school director (or their designee) with input from the respective campus, as appropriate. The faculty member will be given a rating of “satisfactory or better” or “less than satisfactory”. If the annual review rating is “less than satisfactory,” the written report must include an explanation for the decision, and all subsequent annual reviews will be comprehensive or intensive until a rating of “satisfactory” or better is achieved. Additionally, an invitation will be issued from the department chair/school director to meet and discuss the review.

**Comprehensive Review (Revised annual review)**
The following individuals must complete a comprehensive review:

- Pre-tenure faculty (every year)
- Tenured faculty (every other year)
- Non-tenure track faculty (every other year)
- When requested by the faculty member or chair/director
The materials to be submitted include an updated Activity Insight report, updated curriculum vitae, and a summary of accomplishments that includes an overview of the position (including percentages of appointment), teaching accomplishments, research contributions, and service accomplishments. If the faculty member is pre-tenure, the summary should include a review of annual accomplishments as well as a cumulative review of progress toward tenure.

The comprehensive review is performed by the department chair/school director in consultation with appropriate faculty supervisors at the WSU Bremerton, Everett, Spokane, Tri-Cities, and Vancouver campuses, research and extension centers, or other locations as appropriate. Each comprehensive review will result in a written report from the chair to the dean and vice chancellor for academic affairs (dependent on college and WSU campus). The report sent to the faculty member should include an invitation to meet face-to-face with the chair, if the faculty member so desires.

If an annual review rating of “some improvement needed” or “substantial improvement needed” is assigned, then the report will include a list of goals and expectations intended to help the faculty member achieve a “satisfactory” or above annual review rating at the next review, which must be comprehensive or intensive.

**Intensive Reviews** *(Comprehensive review plus revised third-year review and progress toward promotion)*

The intensive review is a two-part review that includes a comprehensive review and a career progress review. The comprehensive review is the same as that described above. The career progress review evaluates the progress of the candidate toward tenure and/or promotion, provides feedback relative to university and department expectations, identifies area of improvement, and offers recommendations that may assist the candidate in determining future work. Pre-tenured faculty typically undergo one intensive review (at the third year), and tenured faculty who are eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to request an intensive review every four (4) to six (6) years.

The materials to be submitted should be prefaced by a table of contents. The table of contents does not need to be numbered by page. Materials for the career progress review should be assembled in the order indicated below:

- Third-Year Tenure Progress Review form (includes dean(s) and chancellor/vice chancellor for academic affairs where applicable, academic director, department chair(s)/school director(s) evaluation in the case of a joint appointment);
- Current curriculum vitae;
- Updated Activity Insight report;
- Comprehensive Reviews/ Past Progress Toward Tenure;
• Statements (e.g., context, scholarship, service) are written by the faculty member (limited to two pages each). The context statement may include expectations placed on a faculty member by circumstances extant at research stations or regional campuses, the requirement of joint appointments or other special circumstances such as commitments to student groups. Scholarship and service are often adequately represented in the vitae. However, if the faculty member would like to clarify the themes of his or her scholarship and/or service activities, he or she may provide short descriptions;

• Teaching portfolio (includes goals, responsibilities, evaluations, results and appendix, or exhibits). The narrative is limited to five pages. The teaching portfolio should be presented in the approved format. Refer to the Faculty Manual, Section III: http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/.

• Faculty recommendations; and

• Supporting materials (e.g., a statement on the faculty member’s progress toward tenure from his or her formal mentor(s), articles).

The comprehensive portion of the intensive review is performed by the chair in consultation with appropriate faculty supervisors at the WSU Bremerton, Everett, Spokane, Tri-Cities, and Vancouver campuses, research and extension centers, or other locations as appropriate, and matches the procedure for the comprehensive review outlined above.

The career progress portion of the intensive review is coordinated by the chair and normally requires participation from all faculty and administrators eligible to perform tenure or promotion evaluations for the candidate. For pre-tenured faculty, the intensive review procedures will match those for final tenure consideration, except that external professional evaluations are not required. For tenured and non-tenure track faculty seeking feedback, the career progress portion of the review can be limited to the department or college level.

Each intensive review will result in two reports: a comprehensive review report and a career progress report. In addition, the chair will meet face-to-face with the candidate to discuss both reports. The comprehensive review report is sent by the chair to the dean and campus vice chancellor for academic affairs (dependent on college and WSU campus), and to the faculty member who is being reviewed. The rating given in the comprehensive review report will serve as the annual review rating anywhere an annual review rating is used. The chair should provide the candidate with a copy of the career progress report prior to the face-to-face meeting.

For pre-tenured faculty, the career progress report will be sent to the dean and campus vice chancellor for academic affairs (dependent on college and WSU campus), and follow the same procedures as that for the final tenure review, except that external professional evaluations are not required. **Intensive reviews for pre-tenure faculty in their third-year are due April 6, 2018 to the Provost’s Office.**
A determination that the progress toward tenure is “unsatisfactory” can lead to non-reappointment as described in Section III.G.1 of the Faculty Manual. In this event, the faculty member may, within thirty (30) calendar days after notification of non-reappointment, petition the Faculty Status Committee to review the decision upon allegations either of inadequate consideration, violation of academic freedom, or substantial procedural irregularity.

**Executive Policy (EP) #29 is the operative document that outlines the roles and responsibilities of the chair/director, academic director, dean, and the vice chancellor for academic affairs (VCAA) in the annual review process.** The chair/director is responsible for assigning merit evaluations to all faculty regardless of campus. Academic directors will provide input to the chair/director on all unit faculty located on the academic director’s respective campus at least two weeks before reviews are due to the dean, and the chair/director will explicitly incorporate this input into the annual review narrative. The dean, and VCAA for faculty not located in Pullman, will review the narratives, provide additional commentary, and assign an evaluation before submitting the reviews to the provost. If the dean and VCAA cannot agree on an evaluation for a non-Pullman faculty member, the VCAA may submit a dissenting review.

The original forms for abridged, comprehensive, and intensive reviews should be retained at the college level and a copy should be sent to Human Resource Services. All dissenting reviews are to be forwarded through the dean to the Office of the Provost. Additionally, a collection of annual review forms for each college need to be forwarded to the provost, along with a roster of all faculty required to undergo an annual review, indicating whether the review was intensive, comprehensive, or abridged, and the ratings assigned. **Information must be received in the Provost’s Office by May 4, 2018 (with the exception of pre-tenure third-year intensive review due April 6, 2018).**

Fillable forms and frequently asked questions can be found at: [https://provost.wsu.edu](https://provost.wsu.edu). More information regarding the abridged, comprehensive, and intensive reviews can be found in Section III.C.3 (tenure-track) and Section V.E.2 (non-tenure track) of the Faculty Manual ([http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual](http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual)).

**Implementation Process**
The Provost’s Office and Faculty Senate have jointly developed an implementation plan as follows:

**Pre-Tenure (Probationary) Faculty**
- All pre-tenure (probationary) faculty will undergo a comprehensive review unless they are scheduled for the mid-period (typically in the third year) or final year intensive review.
Newly Tenured and/or Promoted Faculty
• All faculty who were tenured and/or promoted during the previous academic year or began working at WSU as a tenured faculty member during the review year, will undergo an abridged review. Thereafter, they will alternate between comprehensive and abridged review.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Who Were Not Reviewed for the 2016-17 Academic Year
• All faculty who hold a non-tenure track position and were not reviewed for the 2016-17 academic year (either because they are new or because they did not have an annual review) will undergo a comprehensive or intensive review. Thereafter, they will alternate between abridged and comprehensive review or an intensive review if they seek promotion.

Established Tenured and Non-Tenure Track Faculty
• For the 2017 review year, faculty who held their current rank in fall 2016, and received a satisfactory rating (3.0 or above) on the 2016 annual review, will undergo an abridged review if their last names begin with A – M. Beginning with the 2018 review year, they will alternate between comprehensive and abridged review.

• For the 2017 review year, faculty who held their current rank in fall 2016, and received a satisfactory rating (3.0 or above) on the 2016 annual review, will undergo a comprehensive review if their last names begin with N – Z. Beginning with the 2017 review year, they will alternate between abridged and comprehensive review.

• For the 2017 review year, all faculty who held their current rank in fall 2016, and received an unsatisfactory rating (less than 3.0) on the 2016 annual review, will undergo either a comprehensive or intensive review, to be determined by the unit leader.

Activity Insight
All faculty are required to use Activity Insight (the replacement for WORQS) to compile their annual reviews, regardless of whether they used WORQS in previous years. Login is available at: https://www.digitalmeasures.com/login/wsu/faculty.

It is imperative that users review all of the populated personnel information carefully as it has been provided from various university databases. Kindly report any errors to the appropriate unit administrator, who will ensure the master university database is updated. It will take approximately 5-7 business days for the change to appear within Activity Insight.

The interface has a link to a fully searchable reference guide that will help determine where to report specific types of activities. We have also made available two complete, 90-minute Zoom presentations on how to navigate the interface. Brief video tutorials on how to utilize specific
screens will be available in the near future. These resources can be found at https://provost.wsu.edu/activity-insight. New materials are added regularly, so kindly refer to the website. The above website also includes a list of all screens and fields required by the university for annual reports. Respective college requirement lists will be available in the near future.

**Administrative Professional Reviews**

Annual Review Forms for Administrative Professional employees can be found in the Business Policy Procedures Manual 60.55. Administrative Professional personnel may submit their materials to their supervisors over the Activity Insight system, but 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.

Thank you for your assistance as we implement these necessary and significant changes to our annual review policies and processes, as well as a new faculty reporting tool. I believe the new system will provide better feedback to our faculty and staff, while reducing the time demands of annual reviews on faculty, staff, and administrators.

Cc: Human Resource Services
NAME ________________________________________________ WSU ID# ______________________________

ACADEMIC _____________________ ANNUAL _____________________ 10 MONTH ____________________

DEGREE _________________________________________ DEGREE YEAR _______________________________

TITLE ________________________________________________________________________________________

PROGRAM __________________________________ BUDGET _________________ % SERVICE _____________

DEPARTMENT ________________________________________________________________________________

DATE OF APPOINTMENT TO WSU ________________ YEAR OF TENURE CONSIDERATION _________________

Rating:
____ Satisfactory or better (comments not required)
____ Less than satisfactory (comments required below)

Comments:
(Below comments should focus on areas to be addressed for improvement to become satisfactory)

DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S SIGNATURE     DATE

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S NAME (TYPED)
As the reviewed candidate, my signature indicates that I have received a copy of this review. I understand that I may have a response permanently attached to this review.

__________________________________________  ____________________________
EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE      DATE

__________________________________________  ____________________________
DEAN’S SIGNATURE*       DATE
*The Dean’s signature indicates only that the Dean has reviewed this form. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the conclusions.

__________________________________________  ____________________________
CHANCELLOR’S SIGNATURE*       DATE
NAME ________________________________________________ WSU ID# ______________________________

ACADEMIC _____________________ ANNUAL _____________________ 10 MONTH ____________________

DEGREE _________________________________________ DEGREE YEAR _______________________________

TITLE ________________________________________________________________________________________

PROGRAM __________________________________ BUDGET _________________ % SERVICE ______________

DEPARTMENT ________________________________________________________________________________

DATE OF APPOINTMENT TO WSU ________________ YEAR OF TENURE CONSIDERATION ______________

Rating  
____ Especially meritorious performance (EMP)  
____ Strong performance beyond satisfactory (SP)  
____ Satisfactory (S)  
____ Some improvement needed (SIN)  
____ Substantial improvement needed (SUB)  

Table below should only be completed for pre-tenure/tenure track faculty

Please insert a yearly rating on teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities and service/outreach on
the table below. Please use the above ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TEACHING</th>
<th>RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SERVICE/OUTREACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year Review Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF APPLICABLE, LIST WORK BELOW COMPLETED BEFORE JOINING WSU ONLY IF CREDIT HAS BEEN GIVEN FOR THIS WORK IN THE LETTER OF HIRE.
EVALUATION WEIGHTS ASSIGNED TO THE DUTIES OF TEACHING, RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES AND SERVICE/OUTREACH

PROGRESS ON TEACHING AT WSU

PROGRESS ON RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES AT WSU

PROGRESS ON SERVICE/OUTREACH AT WSU

OTHER COMMENTS

SUMMARY
As Department Chair, my signature indicates that this statement reflects my understanding of the collective views of the appropriate faculty of the department (as defined by the Faculty Manual) pertaining to the comprehensive review of this candidate, that these respective members had the opportunity to review this statement before it was shared with the candidate, and that I have met with the candidate to discuss this review.

DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S SIGNATURE

DATE

DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S NAME (TYPED)

As the reviewed candidate, my signature indicates that I have received a copy of this review and have met with the Department Chair to discuss the review. I understand that I may have a response permanently attached to this review.

EMPLOYEE’S SIGNATURE

DATE

DEAN’S SIGNATURE*

DATE

*The Dean’s signature indicates only that the Dean has reviewed this form. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the conclusions.

CHANCELLOR’S SIGNATURE*

DATE

*The Dean’s signature indicates only that the Dean has reviewed this form. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the conclusions.
NAME ________________________________________________ WSU ID# ______________________________

ACADEMIC ___________________ ANNUAL ________________ 10 MONTH __________________

DEGREE ______________________________ DEGREE YEAR ______________________________

TITLE ______________________________________________________________________________________

PROGRAM ______________________________ BUDGET ______________ % SERVICE ______________

DEPARTMENT ________________________________________________________________________________

DATE OF APPOINTMENT TO WSU ______________

Rating:

___ Well prepared (WP)

___ Satisfactory (S)

___ Improvement needed (IN)

___ Unsatisfactory (U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL ACTION - *Indicate numbers for each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL PREPARED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVEMENT NEEDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below, explain in detail the rationale for the ranking provided above. Explicitly provide explanation of needed areas of improvement; including an assessment of the likelihood of improvement prior to tenure and/or promotion consideration.
As Department Chair, my signature indicates that this statement reflects my understanding of the collective views of the appropriate faculty of the department (as defined by the Faculty Manual) pertaining to the intensive review of this candidate, that these respective members had the opportunity to review this statement before it was shared with the candidate, and that I have met with the candidate to discuss this review.

______________________________________________________  ____________________________
DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S SIGNATURE     DATE

______________________________________________________  ____________________________
DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S NAME (TYPED)

As the reviewed candidate, my signature indicates that I have received a copy of this review and have met with the Department Chair to discuss the review. I understand that I may have a response permanently attached to this review.

______________________________________________________  ____________________________
EMPLOYEE’S SIGNATURE      DATE

______________________________________________________  ____________________________
DEAN’S SIGNATURE*       DATE
*The Dean’s signature indicates only that the Dean has reviewed this form. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the conclusions.

______________________________________________________  ____________________________
CHANCELLOR’S SIGNATURE*      DATE
2017 Intensive Review Faculty Evaluation Form
Form for Pre-Tenured Candidates

Faculty should be aware that upon request, the candidate has the right, by law, to be provided the entire intensive review file, including evaluations.

INTENSIVE REVIEW FOR

This form is advisory regarding the candidate’s progress toward tenure. It is to be completed by all tenured faculty members in the department and forwarded through their principal administrative officers to the provost. Together with other material, the information furnished by this form will be used in evaluating the qualifications of the faculty member under review. The form will not become part of the candidate’s personnel file. Information relating to assessment of the candidate is available through the department office. You are requested to review it.

You should clearly indicate, by marking the appropriate recommendation below, whether you think this person is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. All recommendations must include a justification and explanation. Written comments should provide a discussion of your recommendation, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and assessing his or her progress toward tenure. If some or substantial improvement is needed, please specify what aspect of the candidate’s performance needs improvement. Include frank, objective comments concerning such matters as research and creative scholarship, teaching effectiveness, service to the institution, and potential for growth.

In some circumstances, the intensive review can lead to non-reappointment. This would occur only when performance and progress toward tenure are judged to be so unsatisfactory after review by the unit’s tenured faculty, the chair, the dean, the chancellor or vice chancellor for academic affairs (as appropriate) and the provost, that there is little likelihood that the candidate will meet the criteria for tenure.

RECOMMENDATION

_____ Well Prepared
_____ Satisfactory
_____ Improvement Needed
_____ Unsatisfactory
Faculty should be aware that upon request, the candidate has the right, by law, to be provided the entire intensive review file, including evaluations.

INTENSIVE REVIEW FOR

This form is advisory regarding the candidate's progress. It is to be completed by the appropriate faculty in the department (as defined by the Faculty Manual) and forwarded through their principal administrative officers to the provost. Together with other material, the information furnished by this form will be used in evaluating the qualifications of the faculty member under review. The form will not become part of the candidate's personnel file. Information relating to assessment of the candidate is available through the department office. You are requested to review it.

You should clearly indicate, by marking the appropriate recommendation below, whether you think this person is making satisfactory progress toward promotion. All recommendations must include a justification and explanation. Written comments should provide a discussion of your recommendation, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and assessing his or her progress. If some or substantial improvement is needed, please specify what aspect of the candidate's performance needs improvement. Include frank, objective comments concerning such matters as research and creative scholarship, teaching effectiveness, service to the institution, and potential for growth.

In some circumstances, the intensive review can lead to non-reappointment. For more information, please see the Faculty Manual.

RECOMMENDATION

______ Well Prepared

______ Satisfactory

______ Improvement Needed

______ Unsatisfactory