FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

SG 3.07

Date of Last Update:
April 03, 2026

Approved By:

- University Academic Senate / Provost

Responsible Office:
Provost Office

POLICY STATEMENT

Faculty Evaluation Procedures:

A. Written Performance Expectations

Each unit will develop written performance expectations (for contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leave) of all unit faculty as appropriate to various ranks. These expectations should be specific to the disciplinary focus of the unit but compatible with the performance expectations of all faculty as expressed in the Faculty Handbook and of the college/school in which the unit is housed.

B. Faculty Workload Reports and Faculty Workload Plans

Annually, by **October 1**, each faculty member will prepare a Faculty Workload Plan (FWP) for the next calendar year and by **February 1** submit the Faculty Workload Report for the preceding calendar year. These documents should address how the faculty member's activities and achievements comply with the general expectations of the unit, college/school, and the university. The Faculty Workload Plans and Faculty Workload Reports will be reviewed by the unit head and the dean of the college (or by a designee of the dean) for consistency with unit and college expectations and be made available to the unit faculty members.

C. Student Course Evaluations

1. Normally, student evaluations of each course are completed each semester.

2. The faculty member may request that unfairly prejudicial comments be redacted. This request is made in writing to the Unit Head. The decision to approve/disapprove the request will be made by the Unit Head, or a standing or ad hoc committee in the unit. This provision is

intended to cover offensive, racist, sexist, homophobic, and other personal comments, and is not intended to exclude from the file negative comments directly related to the teaching of the course. A department decision not to remove specific comments may be appealed to the Dean of the College.

D. Peer Evaluations

See the process identified in Board of Trustees' Policies BOT 4.2.3 through 4.2.10.

E. Unintentional Biases

1. GVSU works to institute policies and processes into assessment procedures that mitigate the potential for bias based on identity, including, but not limited to age, color, disability, height, weight, familial status, marital status, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sex/gender (including gender identity and expression), sexual orientation, veteran or active-duty military status. Nonetheless,
Grand Valley recognizes that there remain unintentional biases that can potentially affect assessment of student and faculty at this institution.

2. In continuing to work to make the institution more inclusive, equitable, and welcoming for all, faculty members are encouraged to reflect on and temper biases in assessment and in all other evaluative processes.

F. Collegiality

1. Collegiality refers to behaviors that enable faculty to carry out their functions as members of a community characterized by mutual respect and freedom from harassment and discrimination.

Non-collegiality is normally a pattern of behavior that includes but is not limited to: demeaning comments or behaviors; comments and behaviors that reflect or promote bias; and instances of harassment or discrimination. Faculty members are expected to refrain from engaging in non-collegial behavior that threatens or harms the functionality of the unit or the university community.

2. Collegiality should be understood in professional, not personal, terms, as it relates to the performance of a faculty member's duties. Collegiality does not refer to one's view of another's social skills or position on controversial issues, neither of which should be part of the faculty evaluation process. Nor does collegiality require a display of enthusiasm, dedication, or "fit" within the unit.

3. Collegiality is not a fourth, separate evaluation criterion at Grand Valley. Only the three criteria specified in the General Personnel Policies (i.e., teaching/professional effectiveness,

scholarly/creative activities, and service) are appropriately part of the evaluation process. However, non-collegial behavior can be relevant to those three criteria during a personnel action and may influence the outcome. For example, if a pattern of non-collegial behavior affects a unit's ability to function, such behavior may be brought up in evaluation processes under the service evaluation criterion.

4. Allegations of non-collegiality should be addressed consistent with the procedures for conduct concerns detailed in SLT 3.3, unless such allegations may constitute discrimination, harassment, or misconduct based on a protected characteristic (which must be reported to and investigated by the Office of Civil Rights and Title IX). Consistent with SLT 3.3, informal resolution of allegations on non-collegiality is encouraged, and employees should attempt to address concerns directly with colleagues or their unit head before initiating a formal process. The resolution of a formal process under SLT 3.3 can be included on the agenda for a personnel action pertaining to the involved faculty member, but the unit head must communicate the inclusion of this information on the agenda in writing to the faculty member. Similarly, such resolutions may be documented in the faculty member's annual evaluation.

See Standards of Conduct Policy for Employees (SLT 3.3) for processes that address conduct concerns.

See also SLT 3.3.1.A: "The University's Non-Retaliation Policy for Faculty and Staff strictly prohibits any form of retaliation against individuals who make good faith reports of violations of laws, regulations, or University policies."

5. Allegations of research misconduct, illegal activity, violations of GVSU's policy prohibiting discrimination, harassment, or other misconduct are separate matters and should be addressed through proper procedures.

See SLT 9.1 INTERIM Policy prohibiting discrimination, harassment and misconduct for all faculty, students, employees, and third parties and SG 3.05 Professional Ethics.

G. Contract Renewals, Promotion and Tenure Decisions

The process for personnel evaluations for contract renewals, promotion, and tenure decisions is outlined in the Board of Trustees' Policies BOT 4.2.9. Unit Heads, Chairs of Unit Personnel Committees, and Chairs of College Personnel Committees will participate in regular training, implemented by the Office of the Provost, concerning personnel policies and procedures. See also the Faculty Personnel Actions Workbook.

The unit head or designee(s) refers to the member or members designated by the unit to carry out the personnel review process, as specified in the Board of Trustees' Policies BOT 4.2.10.

Evaluation Principles. The evaluation process is designed to create an open, uniform, and equitable procedure for the review of faculty by their peers. The central principle of this process is to have an informed, candid, and open, job-related discussion of the candidate in a unit meeting followed by a unit vote and written recommendation. This is accomplished by the following steps given in outline form (specific details for each step are in the relevant sections):

1. The submission by the unit head and the candidate to the unit of materials necessary for the action under consideration, including relevant Faculty Workload Plans and Faculty Workload Reports.

2. An agenda for a unit meeting based on the candidate's review materials and unit regular faculty's input after review of the candidate's materials. This input should address both the candidate's achievements and the writer's concerns as to how the candidate has addressed the criteria for review.

3. A unit meeting where the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate are discussed followed by a unit vote on the personnel action. The first motion for a vote on the personnel action under consideration is for the action (for renewal, for promotion, or for tenure).

4. A unit recommendation prepared after the unit meeting based on the discussion and written comments. This recommendation is submitted to the dean.

5. A review of the unit action by a College/Library Personnel Committee whose role is to:

a. ascertain whether the unit has followed the procedures for contract renewal, etc.

b. ascertain whether the unit has adequately discussed all the issues raised by the regular faculty of the unit about the candidate under discussion.

c. determine whether substantive issues require the Committee to contradict the unit's recommendation.

d. in the absence of a valid vote by the unit, to make a recommendation based on its own judgment.

Evaluation Procedure Flow Chart.

A Flow Chart of the evaluation procedure is available on the Office of the Provost website.