

ACTION ITEM #3

Revisions to the Faculty Manual – Annual Review Process for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Daniel J. Bernardo)

September 16, 2016

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS

SUBJECT: Revisions to the Faculty Manual

PROPOSED: That the Board of Regents approve the attached revisions to the Faculty Manual – Annual Review Process for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

SUBMITTED BY: Daniel J. Bernardo, Provost and Executive Vice President

**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 on career progress; and 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.

In the Spring of 2015, the Faculty Senate voted to return the annual review document to the Faculty Affairs Committee, who then revised the document in the Fall of 2015. On March 22, 2016, the Faculty Affairs Committee approved bringing forward the attached to replace Section V.E.2 of the Faculty Manual, which outline the policies and procedures for the annual review of non-tenure track faculty.

This recommendation was passed by the Faculty Senate on April 14, 2016.

Attachment: *FAC Proposal 3/24/16 to replace Faculty Manual V.E.2*

FAC PROPOSAL 3/24/16
To replace *Faculty Manual V.E.2*

c) Reviews of Faculty Performance

Indefinite term faculty who will continue and fixed term faculty eligible for rehire at the end of their contracts must be included in the formal annual review process. Faculty performance will be reviewed annually through one of the following three procedures:

- an abridged review
- a comprehensive review
- an intensive review.

Annual reviews give faculty the opportunity to highlight, reflect on, and obtain feedback about their accomplishments over the past calendar year and how this work enhances their overall career.

Annual reviews are to provide the following information as appropriate:

- An appraisal of each faculty member's progress towards promotion, if the faculty member is eligible for promotion.
- A rating of each faculty member's annual (or biennial) performance in the context of his or her cumulative work.

Reviews will be differentiated as follows:

Faculty normally undergo comprehensive and abridged reviews in alternate years.

Faculty eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to request an intensive review, in lieu of a comprehensive or abridged review, every four (4) to six (6) years. Notice of the request to undergo an intensive review must be communicated to the chair by a due date set by the chair and communicated to the faculty.

If a faculty member receives an annual review rating of less than satisfactory, all subsequent annual reviews will be comprehensive or intensive until a rating of satisfactory or better is achieved.

In the years in which a faculty member is due an abridged review, it is the prerogative of the faculty member or the chair, in consultation with the dean, academic director, or other supervisor, to elect a comprehensive review as warranted.

Abridged Review

Purpose and Criteria. Abridged reviews are intended for faculty who continue to perform at or above expectations. They normally occur the year following a year in which the faculty member received an annual review rating of satisfactory or above on a comprehensive or intensive review.

Submission. By the due date set by the department chair (or academic director), the faculty member will submit a *curriculum vitae* and a short description of his or her accomplishments since the previous annual review.

Procedure. The abridged review is performed by the chair, except on urban campuses, where the review is performed by the academic director in consultation with the chair.

Results. Each abridged review will result in a written report sent by the chair (or academic director) to the dean and the faculty member reviewed. The report sent to the faculty member should include an invitation to meet face-to-face with the chair (or academic director) if the faculty member so desires. Reports will contain an annual review rating of either

- satisfactory or better

- 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.

Comprehensive Review

Purpose and Criteria. Comprehensive reviews are intended to evaluate the performance of the faculty member and to provide feedback relative to university and department expectations. Each comprehensive review will consider the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions since the last comprehensive or intensive review in the context of his or her cumulative performance. All faculty will undergo comprehensive reviews either annually or biennially.

Submission. By the due date set by the chair (or academic director), each faculty member is expected to provide a *curriculum vitae* that includes information relevant to their job description. This may include, but is not limited to, information concerning education, instructional performance, research activities and publications, awards, professional experience, service activities, and affiliations, as well as a summary of his or her activities since the last comprehensive or intensive review.

Procedure. The comprehensive review is performed by the department chair, except on urban campuses, where the review is performed by the academic director in consultation with the chair.

Results. Each comprehensive review will result in a written report from the chair (or academic director) to the dean and the faculty member who was reviewed. The report sent to the faculty member should include an invitation to meet face-to-face with the chair (or academic director), if the faculty member so desires. Reports will contain:

- The faculty member's percentage appointment and primary responsibilities
- Whether the review is based on an annual or biennial time frame
- A summary and written evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each of his or her areas of responsibility, since the last comprehensive or intensive review, viewed in the context of his or her cumulative performance
- An assessment of the faculty member's progress toward promotion, when applicable
- 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.

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. The list should clearly identify areas in which performance is deemed deficient and specific recommendations to correct the deficit.

Optionally, the report may also contain:

- An evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward previously set goals and expectations, as approved by the chair
- A list of goals and expectations to be evaluated at the next comprehensive review
- Additional comments, if any, from the faculty member's immediate supervisor.

Faculty on three to five year appointments may have their appointments reduced to one year if a rating of “substantial improvement needed” is assigned.

Intensive Review

Purpose and Criteria. 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 towards promotion, provides feedback relative to university and department expectations, identifies relevant deficiencies, and offers recommendations that may assist the candidate in determining future work. Faculty who are eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to request an intensive review every four (4) to six (6) years.

Procedures. The intensive review contains two parts, each with its own rating.

The comprehensive portion of the intensive review is performed by the chair, except on urban campuses, where the review is performed by the academic director in consultation with the chair, 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 promotion evaluations for the candidate.

Submission. By the due date set by the chair, each candidate is expected to provide a *curriculum vitae* that includes information relevant to their job description. This may include, but is not limited to, information concerning education, instructional performance, research activities and publications, awards, professional experience, service activities, and affiliations, as well as copies of select publications and a teaching portfolio. He or she may submit, in addition, a context statement, a research statement, and descriptions of his or her external and institutional service activities. A summary of his or her activities since the last comprehensive or intensive review should also be provided.

Results. 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 (or academic director) to the dean 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 career progress report is prepared by the chair and should reflect the views of the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate’s promotion. This report should highlight the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses and include recommendations for improvement. The candidate should be advised according to the following categories:

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

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

Faculty on three to five year appointments may have their appointments reduced to one year if a rating of “substantial improvement needed” is assigned on the comprehensive review portion of the intensive review.

Faculty Responses to Annual Review Evaluations

After receiving the annual review report, the chair shall provide the faculty member a minimum of 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 content 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 it to the dean.

Information sent to the Provost's Office

The collection of annual review forms for each college or unit will 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.

Merit-Based Salary Increases

If a merit-based raise is available, it will be based on the two most recent annual review reports, with two exceptions:

(1) For recently appointed faculty members who do not yet have two annual review reports, the merit portion of their salary increase will be based on the available reports.

(2) If more than two years have passed since a merit increase was available, the raise will be based on the annual review reports since the last merit increase was available.

Ordinarily, salary increases for both annual and academic-year employees will take effect on the same date.