

## ACTION ITEM #3

### Revisions to the Faculty Manual – Annual Review Process (Erica Weintraub Austin)

May 6, 2016

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS

SUBJECT: Revisions to the Faculty Manual

PROPOSED: That the Board of Regents approve the attached changes to the Faculty Manual – Annual Review Process

SUBMITTED BY: Erica Weintraub Austin, Interim Co-Provost

SUPPORTING  
INFORMATION:

In 2014, Interim Provost Daniel Bernardo appointed a Task Force for improvement of Faculty Annual Reviews. Half of the task force was appointed by the Provost and half was appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The goals of the Task Force were to simplify the annual review process and decrease the time spent by faculty and administrators on annual reviews; move from a norm- based rating system towards a criteria-based rating system; provide more feedback to faculty, particularly associate professors, on career progress; change the context of the annual reviews from an annual snapshot to that of viewing recent work in the context of the faculty member's overall career.

On January 14, 2016, the Faculty Affairs Committee unanimously approved bringing forward the wording below to replace Sections III.E.3.c, d, and e of the Faculty Manual, which outline the policies and procedures for the annual review of tenure track faculty.

#### Comprehensive Review Results

"An annual review rating assigned to the faculty member's performance according to one of the following categories:

- Especially meritorious performance
- strong performance beyond satisfactory
- satisfactory
- some improvement needed
- substantial improvement needed."

### Intensive Review Results

"The career progress report is prepared by the chair and should reflect the views of the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate's tenure and/or promotion. The report should highlight the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and include recommendations for improvement and the likelihood for tenure and/promotion. In the case of untenured faculty: The the candidate should be advised according to the following categories:

- Well prepared. The candidate is encouraged to seek tenure and/or promotion at the next opportunity.
- Satisfactory. The candidate appears to be building an appropriate profile, but has not yet achieved the standards expected for tenure and/or promotion.
- Improvement needed. The candidate should review the criteria for tenure and/or promotion and the career progress report carefully, and seek advice from other faculty in the university and his or her discipline.
- Unsatisfactory. The candidate is not on track for tenure and/or promotion.

The chair should provide the candidate with a copy of the career progress report prior to the face-to-face meeting."

### Faculty Responses to Annual Review Evaluations

"After receiving the annual review report, the chair shall provide the faculty member ~~has~~ a minimum of ~~five (5)~~ ten (10) business days to sign the report, indicating that he or she has had the opportunity to read the report and to discuss it with the chair and/or appropriate faculty supervisors at urban campuses, research and extension centers, or other distant locations. A faculty member's dissent regarding contents of the report may be appended to the signed report. When a dissent is appended, the faculty member must receive written acknowledgement within fifteen (15) business days that the statement has been reviewed by the chair's immediate supervisor (normally the dean). At the same time that a response is sent to the faculty member, the chair's supervisor will forward to the provost the annual review, the faculty member's response to that review, and the supervisor's response to the faculty member. After receiving this information, the provost has an additional fifteen (15) business days to provide a written acknowledgement to the faculty member and chair's supervisor that he or she has reviewed all of the statements. For faculty located on urban campuses, a faculty member's dissent will first be routed through the chancellor (or his/her designee) for review before forwarding to the dean."

A minor amendment was approved on January 19, 2016. This recommendation was passed by the Faculty Senate on February 11, 2016.