

**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
OF THE FACULTY SENATE
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE
FACULTY SENATE TO BE HELD ON
May 4, 2015**

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 four University of Tennessee fellows appointed to the 2015 SECU Academic Leadership Development Program undertook a project to create a workshop for department heads on the planning part of the annual performance review; and

WHEREAS, the fellows recommend that the current annual review rating scale be simplified because each step in the rating scale has four different descriptors, counting the numbers as descriptors; and

WHEREAS, the number ratings create a misleading expectation that the overall rating will or should be an average of the ratings for each category of effort (teaching, research, service) and the Board of Trustees’ “Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure” do not mandate the use of numbers; and

WHEREAS, a simplified rubric will focus the evaluation scale on performance expectations and will provide clearer direction that the basis for evaluations should be general expectations recorded in the unit’s faculty bylaws and expectations established between the unit head the faculty member at the annual performance review and planning meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed —and sought input from the Faculty Senate Executive Council on— the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* related to this issue; now, therefore it is

RESOLVED, that the language in Section 3 of the *Faculty Handbook* and Sections B and C of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* be changed to simplify the new rubric as follows:

New language = underlined
Deleted language = ~~strikethrough~~

Faculty Handbook

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):~~ Fall 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~~ falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank is required to submit an improvement plan.
- For purposes of Cumulative Performance Review, and Overall performance rating of ~~2~~ falls short of meeting expectations for rank is consistent with “Needs Improvement for Rank” in the UT Board of Trustees “Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure.” An evaluation rating of ~~1~~ falls far short of meeting expectations for rank is consistent with “Unsatisfactory for Rank” in the same document.

A faculty member with an Overall performance rating of ~~5, 4, or 3~~ meets, exceeds, or far exceeds expectations for rank 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~~ falls short of meeting expectations for rank 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~~ falls far short of meeting expectations for rank 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~~ falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank 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~~ falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank in the evaluation that necessitated the improvement plan.

Manual for Faculty Evaluation

B. PROCEDURES FOR THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY

1. Initiating the Annual Review Process. The department head manages the process of annual review of tenured and tenure-track faculty in a timely way to ensure compliance with all deadlines for submission of the review forms to the dean and chief academic officer.

a. **Scheduling the annual review conference.** The department head should schedule the annual review conference with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member at least two weeks in advance of the date to allow faculty adequate notice to prepare the required materials.

b. **Preparing for the review conference.** The department head will inform the departmental faculty of the materials that should be prepared and submitted before the conference and the format to be used for submission of materials for the review, in each case as set forth in paragraph B.2. of this Part II.

2. Documents Prepared by the Faculty Member. The faculty member prepares a written summary of work in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. The summary includes work accomplished during the Evaluation Period. Except as otherwise noted at the end of this paragraph 2, it is suggested that each faculty member under review provide to the department head review materials which contain at least the following:

a. summary of the past year's plans and goals developed at the previous year's annual review;

b. a summary of the faculty member's activities and accomplishments during the Evaluation Period in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, in accordance with Section 3.8.1 of the *Faculty Handbook* (the "Faculty Activity Report"), the form and content of which shall be determined based on college and department bylaws, but each of which should include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience;

c. a list of specific plans and goals for the upcoming year;

d. any documentation requested by the department head or required by departmental or collegiate bylaws that evidences the faculty member's activities during the Evaluation Period, which may include information supporting accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service;

e. a completed, signed copy of the Faculty External Compensation and Consulting Annual Report Form (see Appendix A of this manual and Section D. of this Part II); and

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 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.”

3. The Department Head’s Evaluation. The faculty member and the department head have a scheduled conference (a) to discuss the faculty member’s (i) goals for the previous year and (ii) accomplishments during the Evaluation Period and (b) to formulate goals for the faculty member for the coming year.

4. Preparation of the Annual Review Form. The department head documents his or her review of each faculty member on the Faculty Annual Review Form with attachments if necessary. The department head signs the Annual Review Form. The Annual Review Form should include the components set forth below as applicable.

a. The department head writes a narrative describing and discussing the faculty member’s progress on his or her goals for the previous year and the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service during the Evaluation Period, in each case, based on procedures and standards set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, this manual, and the departmental bylaws (“Progress and Performance Narrative”). The Progress and Performance Narrative also outlines goals for the faculty member for the coming year and should include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience. The department head’s review and the Progress and Performance Narrative only shall rely on and include documented and substantiated information available to the department head at the time of the review and shall not be based on rumor or speculation.

b. The department head may, but is not required to, write a Progress and Performance Narrative for a faculty member in any year in which the faculty member is in Good Standing, unless (i) the faculty member requests that the department head write a Progress and Performance Narrative in that year or (ii) it has been three years since the department head has written a Progress and Performance Narrative for that faculty member. In any year in which the department head does not write a Progress and Performance Narrative for a faculty member as permitted by the previous sentence, the department head shall attach to the Annual Review Form that faculty member’s Faculty Activity Report.

c. The department head indicates on the Annual Review Form whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, 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~~, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for 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).

5. Reviewing and Signing the Annual Review Form. The department head gives the Annual Review Form to the faculty member, who reviews and signs it. The faculty member's signature indicates that he or she has read the entire Annual Review Form, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the Progress and Performance Narrative, performance evaluation, or other contents.

6. Responding to the Annual Review Report. The faculty member may prepare a written response to the Annual Review Form. This response should be copied to the department head, and the department head shall include it in the materials forwarded to the dean under paragraph 7 of this Part II.B. The faculty member shall be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt of the finalized Annual Review Form from the department head to submit any written response. If no response is received by the department head after two weeks from the date the faculty member receives the Annual Review Form from the department head, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

7. Transmitting the Evaluation. The department head forwards to the dean the Annual Review Form and any attachments. The department head also forwards any written response received from the faculty member.

8. The Dean's Review of the Annual Review Form.

a. Reviewing and signing the review forms. The dean reviews the Annual Review Forms submitted by each department head and signs the Annual Review Forms, indicating either concurrence with or dissent from the department head's rating of each faculty member.

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, indicating whether the performance of the faculty member far exceeds expectations for rank, 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~~, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for 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 (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.

c. Faculty member's and department heads right to respond. Each of the faculty member and the department head has the right to submit a written response to the dean's rating or the accompanying rationale. Any response by the faculty member should be copied to the dean and the department head, and the dean shall include it in the materials forwarded to the chief academic officer under subparagraph d. of this Part

II.B.8. Similarly, any response by the department head should be copied to the dean and the faculty member, and the dean shall include it in the materials forwarded to the chief academic officer under subparagraph d. of this Part II.B.8. The faculty member and department head will be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt of the dean's rating and rationale to submit any written response. If no response is received after two weeks from the date of receipt of the dean's rating and rationale, the faculty member or department head, as applicable, relinquishes the right to respond.

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 (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.

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 (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 far exceeds expectations for rank, 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, falls short of meeting expectations for rank, or falls far short of meeting expectations for 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 OR UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS~~ of FALLS SHORT OF MEETING EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK OR FALLS FAR SHORT OF MEETING EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK.

Faculty members who receive notice from the chief academic officer that they have received ratings of "~~needs improvement~~" or "~~unsatisfactory~~" "falls short of meeting expectations for rank" or "falls far short of meeting expectations for rank" 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.

1. Administrative Review of the Plan of Improvement. The department head will review each plan of improvement developed and submitted by a faculty member under this Part II.C. The department head must approve the plan before forwarding it to the dean for approval. The dean must approve the plan before forwarding it to the chief academic officer for approval. The chief academic officer will notify the dean, department head, and faculty member of his or her approval of the plan. The department head has primary responsibility for monitoring the progress of the faculty member in accordance with standards and procedures established in the departmental bylaws.

2. Following up on the Plan of Improvement

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 needs improvement or is unsatisfactory shall include a report that clearly describes progress in any area(s) needing improvement or noted as unsatisfactory.

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 [falls far short of meeting expectations for rank](#) in two out of five consecutive annual reviews or whose reviews in any three of five consecutive years indicate performance that ~~needs improvement for his or her rank or is unsatisfactory for his or her rank~~ [falls short of meeting expectations for rank or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank](#) shall undergo a cumulative performance review. This process is described in Part V of this manual.

3. Rating of Unsatisfactory. A faculty member who receives a rating of ~~unsatisfactory~~ [falls far short of meeting expectations for rank](#) shall be ineligible for rewards.