

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CHANGES TO
THE *FACULTY HANDBOOK* AND THE *MANUAL FOR FACULTY EVALUATION*
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT THE MEETING OF THE
FACULTY SENATE TO BE HELD ON FEBRUARY 4, 2013

WHEREAS, under Article III, Section 2.G. of the *Bylaws* of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook* and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee of The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees has proposed a revision to the Board’s Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure to permit a campus either to use the current four-point scale defined in that policy or the seek Board approval for a different scale; and,

WHEREAS this proposed revision to Board policy will require any campus-specific rating scale to explain how it articulates with the current four-point scale; and,

WHEREAS the University of Tennessee Knoxville (UTK) has for four years piloted the use of a five-point scale (allowing faculty performance that is *moderately* above expectations to be distinguished from performance that is *significantly* above expectations) and this five-point scale has been well received by both administrators and faculty at UTK; and,

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate has supported this proposed revision to Board policy and has expressed the desire to continue to use the five-point scale tested for the past four year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the insertion of the following new section 3.8.2 into the *Faculty Handbook* (and the renumbering of the current sections 3.8.2 and 3.8.3 as 3.8.3 and 3.8.4) in order to explain how the five-point scale currently in use at UTK articulates with the four-point scale defined in the Board’s policy.

[3.8.2 Rating Scale to be Applied in Evaluating Faculty Performance](#)

[Faculty performance must be evaluated in a manner consistent with all applicable campus, college, and/or departmental policies, procedures, and bylaws, and must apply the following performance ratings:](#)

- [5 – Outstanding \(Excellent\): Far exceeds expectations for rank](#)
- [4 – More Than Expected \(Very Good\): Exceeds expectations for rank](#)
- [3 – Expected \(Good\): Meets expectations for rank](#)
- [2 – Less Than Expected \(Fair\): Falls short of meeting expectations for rank](#)
- [1 – Unsatisfactory \(Poor\): Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank](#)

[This section explains the articulation between this UTK/UTIA/UTSI-specific](#)

performance rating scale and the scale provided in the Board of Trustees Policies Regarding Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure. That articulation is necessary for application of certain policies and procedures (for example the Cumulative Performance Review process):

- A faculty member who receives an Overall performance rating of a 2 or 1 is required to submit an improvement plan.
- For purposes of Cumulative Performance Review, an Overall performance rating of 2 is consistent with “Needs Improvement for Rank” in UT Board of Trustees Policy Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure.” An evaluation rating of 1 is consistent with “Unsatisfactory for Rank” in the same document.

A faculty member with an Overall performance rating of 5, 4, or 3 is eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines. He/she is also eligible for any across-the-board salary increase.

A faculty member with an Overall rating of 2 is not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines, but he/she is eligible for any across-the-board salary increase.

A faculty member with an Overall rating of 1 is not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase that may be authorized under campus, college, and/or departmental rules or guidelines, nor is he/she eligible for any across-the-board salary increase.

Within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed annual review form, any faculty member whose overall performance is rated either 2 or 1 must collaborate with the Department Head on an Annual Review Improvement Plan to be reviewed by the Head and recommended by him/her to the Dean for review and approval/denial. The next year’s annual review must include a progress report that clearly describes improvements in any area(s) rated at the level of 2 or 1 in the evaluation that necessitated the improvement plan.

3.8.~~32~~ Annual Retention Review for Tenure-Track Faculty Members

In addition to (and at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville and the University of Tennessee Space Institute, coincident with) the annual performance and planning review described in Section 3.8.1, tenure-track faculty members receive an annual retention review. See Section 3.11.3.

3.8.~~43~~ Cumulative Performance Review for Tenured Faculty Members

Cumulative performance reviews for tenured faculty are triggered

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the following revisions in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in order to replace references to the four-point scale with corresponding references to the five point scale.

I. B. 1. e. The department head's report. The department head makes an independent recommendation on retention and reports this recommendation on the Retention Review Form. The department head's report includes a written recommendation to the dean as to retention or non-retention, including an evaluation of performance that uses the ratings for annual performance and planning reviews (see Part II)—from “~~exceeds expectation~~outstanding” to “unsatisfactory.” The department head signs the Retention Review Form.

II.A.1. Policies Governing Annual Review. Policies adopted by The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees require that each faculty member and his or her department head engage in a formal annual performance-and-planning review. Each faculty member's annual performance-and-planning review must proceed from guidelines and criteria contained in Sections [3.8.1](#) [and 3.8.2](#) of the *Faculty Handbook*, this manual, and collegiate or departmental bylaws.

II. B. 2. f. a current *curriculum vitae*.

Collegiate or departmental bylaws may require that less extensive review materials be submitted by a tenured faculty member who (i) received an overall rating in his or her most recent annual review indicating that his or her performance meets, ~~or exceeds,~~ or far exceeds expectations for his or her rank and (ii) is not under a Cumulative Performance Review (as described in Part V of this manual). A faculty member meeting the criteria set forth in clauses (i) and (ii) of the preceding sentence is in “Good Standing.”

II.B.4.c. The department head indicates on the Annual Review Form the faculty member's performance evaluation, selecting from the categories: 5 – Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations for rank; 4 – More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations for rank; 3 – Expected (Good): Meets expectations for rank; 2 – Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations for rank; and 1 – Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank, where the evaluation is ~~whether the performance of the faculty member exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank,~~ based on previously established objectives for that faculty member and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks).

II.B.8.b. Dissent from the department head's rating. In cases where the dean does not concur with the department head's rating, the dean (i) assigns a different rating (5 – Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations for rank; 4 – More Than Expected

(Very Good): Exceeds expectations for rank; 3 – Expected (Good): Meets expectations for rank; 2 – Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations for rank; and 1 – Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank) indicating whether the performance of the faculty member exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank which is based on previously established objectives for that faculty member and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks), and (ii) prepares a written rationale summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the department head's rating. Copies of the dean's rating and rationale must be forwarded to the faculty member and the department head.

II. B. 8. d. Transmitting the Annual Review Forms. The dean forwards the Annual Review Form for each faculty member, together with any attachments and any written responses received from the faculty member and the department head, to the chief academic officer by the deadline established in the Faculty Evaluation Calendar. In addition, the dean prepares a spreadsheet listing all faculty and the ratings for each (5 – Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations for rank; 4 – More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations for rank; 3 – Expected (Good): Meets expectations for rank; 2 – Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations for rank; and 1 – Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank~~exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, unsatisfactory~~), organized by academic department, and forwards the spreadsheet to the chief academic officer with the Annual Review Forms.

II.B.9. Chief Academic Officer's Review of the Annual Review Forms. The chief academic officer reviews the Annual Review Forms, indicates a final decision on the rating to be assigned to the faculty member (5 – Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations for rank; 4 – More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations for rank; 3 – Expected (Good): Meets expectations for rank; 2 – Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations for rank; and 1 – Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank) (~~exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, unsatisfactory for his or her rank~~), and signs the form. Fully executed copies of the Annual Review Form will be returned to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. In cases where the chief academic officer does not concur with the rating given by the dean, the chief academic officer (a) assigns a different rating, indicating ~~whether~~ the performance of the faculty member (5 – Outstanding (Excellent): Far exceeds expectations for rank; 4 – More Than Expected (Very Good): Exceeds expectations for rank; 3 – Expected (Good): Meets expectations for rank; 2 – Less Than Expected (Fair): Falls short of meeting expectations for rank; and 1 – Unsatisfactory (Poor): Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank) and which is ~~exceeds expectations for his or her rank, meets expectations for his or her rank, needs improvement for his or her rank, or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank~~, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks), and (b) prepares a narrative summarizing the reasons for his or her dissent from the dean's rating. Copies of the chief academic

officer's rating and narrative must be forwarded to the faculty member, the dean, and the department head.

C. FOLLOW-UP IN CASES OF ~~NEEDS IMPROVEMENT~~ LESS THAN EXPECTED OR UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS

Faculty members who receive notice from the chief academic officer that they have received ratings of “~~needs improvement~~ less than expected” or “unsatisfactory” must develop a plan of improvement and submit the plan to the department head within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed Annual Review Form (as described in Part II.B.9 of this manual). The faculty member has the responsibility of developing a written response for each area needing attention in the Annual Review Form, including the goals and benchmarks for improvement and the resources, if any, to be allocated for this purpose. The faculty member will follow up on this plan at subsequent annual reviews.

II.C.2.a. Progress reports. To permit the department head to monitor the progress of the faculty member, the faculty member should submit to the department head periodic updates on progress on the goals and benchmarks established in the improvement plan, in the form and at the times requested by the department head. The first annual review following a review rating indicating that the faculty member's performance is less than expected ~~needs improvement~~ or is unsatisfactory shall include a report that clearly describes progress in any area(s) needing improvement or noted as unsatisfactory.

II.C.2.b. Cumulative Performance Review. Cumulative performance reviews for tenured faculty are triggered by the rating from the annual review. A faculty member whose performance is found to be unsatisfactory for his or her rank in two out of five consecutive annual reviews or whose reviews in any three of five consecutive years indicate performance that is less than expected ~~needs improvement~~ for his or her rank or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank shall undergo a cumulative performance review. This process is described in Part V of this manual.

II.C.3 Rating of Unsatisfactory. ~~A faculty member who receives a rating of unsatisfactory shall be ineligible for rewards.~~ [NOTE: This matter is already covered in Section 3.8.2 of the Handbook.]