

*NEW POLICIES RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW
POLICIES ON PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND POST
TENURE REVIEW AND APPROVED BY PRESIDENT SIMMONS*

that the probationary faculty member is making either “satisfactory progress toward tenure” or “unsatisfactory progress toward tenure.” The results of this vote, along with a brief rationale written by the chair of the tenure committee, will be given to the faculty member, chair, and dean. In year 1 there will be no vote, but a brief assessment of productivity, written by the chair of the tenure committee and informed by the committee’s discussion, will be provided to the probationary faculty member, chair, and dean. In the spring of the second and fourth years, the peer review will be guided by Section 15.3.9 of this *Handbook*. (Similarly for this process, in large departments faculty may elect to have smaller screening committees to conduct the peer

16 (T*0.0175t 1t)20.0118 Tc20.6heelformonare20.0510 (h)F8063.17h

evaluation period by simple agreement (in writing) between the faculty member and chair.

- g) No departmental, college, or university quotas shall be established for the purposes of performance evaluation.
- h) The department chair/library coordinator shall discuss with each faculty member the basis for the evaluative judgments and recommendations and provide to the faculty member a written summary of the evaluations, recommendations, and discussion. Also during this meeting, the department chair/library coordinator and the probationary faculty member (as well as tenured faculty in units which elect to do so) shall work collaboratively to establish his/her individual professional goals for the current calendar year.
- i) Faculty members may respond in writing to the department chair's/library coordinator's evaluations and recommendations. This response shall be included with the F2.08 when it is forwarded to the dean of the college/library .
- j) The department chair/library coordinator shall forward a copy of the completed evaluation, all materials considered in the evaluation, and any written response from the faculty member to the dean for review.
- k) The dean may choose to confer with the chair/library coordinator and complete a separate assessment in one or all evaluation categories. However, for the purpose of performance evaluation and assignment of merit reward level, the dean shall indicate a rating of *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory* for each faculty member, provide appropriate annotations, and forward a copy to the faculty member and department chair/library coordinator.
- l) The faculty member may respond in writing to either comments the dean chooses to make or his/her overall performance rating. This response shall be forwarded with the completed evaluation to the provost for review.
- m) When a faculty member receives an overall *satisfactory* performance evaluation from the department chair/library coordinator and the dean, the evaluation process is concluded.
- n) A single overall *unsatisfactory* annual evaluation from the department chair/library coordinator or dean shall result in a consultation with the department chair/library coordinator and/or dean. If the consultation is with the dean, then the faculty member may request that the department chair/library coordinator be present for the consultation. A summary written by the senior administrator present shall be given to all parties involved in the consultation, and a copy signed by all parties shall be attached to the F2.08.

43.4 POST TENURE REVIEW.

- a) The post tenure review process is triggered when a tenured faculty member twice receives within any three year period two overall unsatisfactory annual performance ratings from the department chair/library coordinator and the dean. (For a department chair/library coordinator, the performance ratings will be made by the dean and the AVPAA.) Note: In those departments which elect to have peers conduct a comprehensive performance evaluation of each tenured faculty member at least once every six years after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion – see the second paragraph of Section 43.2 for a description of the process and departmental/faculty responsibilities – the “triggered” approach described above does not apply. Rather, the result of an unsatisfactory rating initiates the post tenure review process described in the remainder of this section. It is the responsibility of the department chair/library coordinator to notify, in writing, the faculty member of the situation and of the two following options. (If the person to be notified is the chair/coordinator, it will be the dean who does so.) The faculty member must either initiate a professional development plan or request that the University Performance Evaluation Appeals Committee review the evaluations given by the department chair/library coordinator and dean. The decision must be given by the faculty member, in writing, to the department chair/library coordinator within ten working days of notification. The University Performance Evaluation Appeals Committee shall consist of one tenured faculty member elected from each college and the library. The committee

shall consider the unsatisfactory evaluations, statements from the faculty member, and other relevant materials and determine if the evaluations were made in an arbitrary or capricious manner. Within 20 working days of the receipt of the appeal, the committee shall submit its findings to the provost. The provost shall notify the faculty member,

responses of the dean/director, and each such case must stand on its own merits. The decision of the provost must be rendered within ten working days of the receipt of the Committee's recommendation, and it is final.

NOTE: The University Performance Evaluation/Merit Salary Increase Appeals Committee will consist of : a dean who is elected by the members of the Academic Council of Deans and who will chair the committee; one department chair, elected by the membership of the Council of Instructional Departments; and one elected faculty member from each academic college and the library, and one faculty member-at-large. At the first meeting, in order to create staggered, 3-year terms, with one-third of the nine members being replaced each year, lots will be drawn so that the terms of the initial nine members are three for one year, three for two years, and three for three years. If the dean, chair, or one of the faculty members is directly involved in the case under review, then he/she must recuse him/herself during consideration of that appeal.

12/1/04