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Overview

This document describes the process for faculty annual review in the School of Architecture. It is based on principles established in the University policy on Annual Performance Reviews\(^1\). That policy makes clear that while the review provides information for salary determination, it should be something much broader:

\[
\text{Done correctly, it is a good personnel practice, providing an occasion for self-evaluation and reassessment of the role a faculty member is playing, which may evolve significantly during the course of a career. It is an opportunity to acknowledge and recognize good work, point out areas for improvement, and, in a few cases, identify productive new uses of a faculty member's talents. It is a means of ensuring that the diverse talents of the entire faculty are productively applied to the many responsibilities of the University. In addition, performance reviews can help identify resource targets--places where additional resources could energize a faculty member whose energy or morale has run low or could lift an already productive member to new levels of achievement.}
\]

The faculty member’s department chair is primarily responsible for this assessment. According to the schedule outlined below, each year the department chair sends a letter to the faculty member that explains the chair’s assessment of the faculty member’s teaching, research, and service. That assessment addresses concrete achievements for the review year, as well as the history and trajectory of ongoing work. The department chair forwards a copy of their assessment letter to the dean. The dean is primarily responsible for annual salary determination, in consultation with the department chair.

This annual review process applies to faculty whose appointment is at least 50 percent in the School of Architecture, including tenure-track, tenured, and full-time general faculty.

Faculty with Divided Appointments

For faculty whose appointment is divided among multiple academic units, the role of department chair described in this document will determined by which academic unit serves as the faculty member’s primary unit, where the faculty member is evaluated for the promotion and tenure process. The head of that unit takes on the role of primary evaluator. In making the assessment, the evaluator will consult with the heads of the other units to which the faculty member is assigned.

\(^1\) https://provost.virginia.edu/node/24
Annual Sequence

1. Reviewed faculty submit annual report materials no later than the Monday preceding the first day of classes of each spring semester.

2. From mid January through mid March, the department chair reviews materials for each faculty member.

3. From mid-March through late April, the department chair holds individual meetings with reviewed faculty to discuss the results of their review.

4. By May 7, the department chair sends to each reviewed faculty member their final review letter, and forwards a copy to the dean.

5. Through May 25, a faculty member who disputes conclusions in the review letter may arrange a meeting with the dean and the department chair to challenge those conclusions. If that meeting does not result in consensus, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter to be included in their personnel file.

Implementation and peer review

For 2019, the process will not include a peer review component. Peer review will be included in 2020 as part of an online review system to be developed during 2019. When implemented, peer review will occur during step 2 of the above sequence; a review team will advise the department chair.