

## **Board of Trustees Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure**

- I. Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the Faculty Member
- II. Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the University Administration
- III. Tenure
  - A. Definition of Tenure
  - B. Eligibility for Tenure Consideration
  - C. Probationary Period
  - D. Criteria for Tenure
  - E. Procedures for Consideration and Grant of tenure
  - F. Locus of Tenure

### **G. Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members**

The University is committed to the evaluation of all faculty members as a means of strengthening the principle of tenure. To that end, the University applies two mechanisms for evaluating and supporting the work of tenured faculty: the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review (detailed primarily in campus faculty handbooks) and the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (detailed in G.2. below and Appendix F). Both review processes focus on the faculty member's contributions to the University's missions through teaching, research (including scholarly and artistic work), service, and clinical care.

Competent teaching is a crucial responsibility for faculty members, and the effective use of appropriate instructional evaluation (including departmental files of class syllabi and related materials, student, and peer evaluation, etc.) is important to all objective review processes. Faculty members with research/creative arts responsibilities should have the quantity and quality of their work fairly assessed. Each faculty member's service contributions should be evaluated impartially.

#### **1. Annual Performance-and-Planning Review**

Each faculty member and his or her **D**epartment **H**ead will engage in a formal annual Performance-and-Planning Review, examining the current fiscal/academic year's activities and planning what should occur during the coming fiscal/academic year. The planning aspects of these annual academic year reviews also should take place in the context of longer-term goals for the campus, college, and department. Each campus shall strive to reward faculty members who more than meet expectations for rank, and administrators shall develop and publish guidelines for each campus to allocate funds for this purpose whenever feasible. Each faculty member's annual review should proceed from guidelines and criteria which are appropriate to the department, college, and campus, and this annual review should be a key element in merit pay or performance-based salary adjustments. A document summarizing the review—including an objective rating of the faculty member's

performance, as listed below – must be signed by the faculty member (to acknowledge receipt of the review document) and the Department Head. The Head must send a copy to the Dean. The Dean must send copies of the documents or a list of names by category to the Chief Academic Officer for review and approval/disapproval.

The performance ratings scale for annual reviews shall be approved by the Board of Trustees, and may include (in whole or in part) the ratings defined below. Unless or until the Board of Trustees approves a campus-specific rating scale, campuses shall employ the rating scale defined below. To ensure seamless application of other faculty policies and procedures related to performance ratings (whether part of this document or some other policy or procedure), any campus-specific rating scale must explain how it articulates with the rating scale defined below. Campus faculty handbooks, college bylaws, and/or department bylaws must specify the substantive performance criteria to be used when conducting performance reviews within the particular unit.

The following performance rating scale is to be applied in evaluating tenured faculty members when no campus-specific scale is in place:

- a. Exceeds Expectations for Rank – eligible for significant merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and department fiscal situations;
- b. Meets Expectations for Rank – eligible for minimum merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and department fiscal situations;
- c. Needs improvement for Rank – not eligible for merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment and requires ~~sd to implement~~ an Annual Review Improvement Plan (see below); and
- d. Unsatisfactory for Rank – not eligible for any salary adjustment and ~~requires~~ an Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (III.G.2. below) to implement an Annual Review Improvement Plan (see below).

Annual Review Improvement Plans: Within 30 days of the annual review, any faculty member with an overall performance rating of ~~rated~~ Needs Improvement for Rank or Unsatisfactory for Rank must collaborate with the 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) for which improvement was required.~~noted as Needs Improvement for Rank or Unsatisfactory for Rank.~~

Appeal Process: Each campus shall have a campus-wide process by which a faculty member may appeal his/her annual review rating. Developing the process should involve the Faculty Senate or an appropriate committee thereof.

## ~~2. Cumulative Performance Review (CPR)~~

~~A comprehensive, formal, cumulative, performance review is triggered for the following tenured faculty members:~~

- ~~a. a faculty member whose annual review is Unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years;~~
- ~~b. a faculty member whose annual review is any combination of Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement in any three of five consecutive years.~~

~~Each campus shall establish policies and procedures for peer evaluation of the faculty member's cumulative performance. Within thirty days of being triggered, a CPR Committee shall be convened by the Dean, who shall determine its chair. This committee shall be composed of appropriate, same or higher rank, tenured departmental faculty members (excluding the Head), and appropriate faculty (same or higher rank) from outside the department. The faculty member being reviewed and the Head may each name a campus tenured professor (same or higher rank) to the committee, which normally should have at least five (5) members including the CPR Committee chair, and at least two additional faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate (one departmental faculty member [same or higher rank] and one non-departmental faculty member [same or higher rank]). The Committee chair shall forward the committee consensus recommendation to the Head, Dean and Chief Academic Officer. Performance ratings for cumulative reviews shall be as follows:~~

- ~~—— Satisfies Expectations for Rank~~
- ~~—— Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank~~

~~If the CPR Committee consensus rates the faculty member's performance as Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank, it may develop with the affected faculty member and Head a written CPR Improvement Plan (which may include, but shall not be limited to, skill-development leave of absence, intensive mentoring, curtailment of outside services, change in load/responsibilities), normally of up to one calendar year, and a means to assess its efficacy, with the plan to be reviewed by the Dean and approved by the Chief Academic Officer; or the committee may recommend to the Dean and Chief Academic Officer that the Chancellor initiate proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).~~

~~If the CPR Committee consensus rates the faculty member's performance as Satisfies Expectations for Rank, the Committee must forward its justification/rationale to the Dean.~~

~~The Dean must recommend one of the following three actions by the Chief Academic Officer:~~

- ~~a. concur that the faculty member's performance has been Satisfies Expectations for Rank, that his/her personnel file should show that both the Committee and the Dean concur in a Satisfactory CPR rating, and that a new five-year period annual review cycle will begin; or~~
- ~~b. find that the faculty member's performance has been Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank (including a rationale for that ranking), and recommend that the Chief Academic Officer should require that the CPR Committee develop with the affected faculty member a written CPR Improvement Plan (which may include, but shall not be limited to, skill-development leave of absence, intensive mentoring, curtailment of outside services, change in load/responsibilities), normally of up to one calendar year, and a means to assess its efficacy; or~~
- ~~c. find that the faculty member's performance has been Fails to Satisfy Expectations for Rank (including a rationale for that ranking), and recommend to the Chancellor that he/she initiate proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).~~

~~At the end of the time allotted for a CPR Improvement Plan, the Head, CPR Committee, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer shall send a written consensus report to the campus Chancellor, recommending:~~

- ~~(i) that the faculty member's performance is Satisfies Expectations for Rank and no other action need be taken at this time; or~~
- ~~(ii) that the faculty member's performance has improved sufficiently to allow for up to one additional year of monitoring of improvement, after which the Head, CPR Committee, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer must by consensus determine if the faculty member's performance is Satisfies Expectations for Rank or recommend that the Chancellor initiate Proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee); or~~

- ~~(iii) — that the Chancellor initiate proceedings, as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*, to terminate the faculty member for adequate cause after the Chancellor has consulted with the Faculty Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (which may delegate its responsibility to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee).~~

## **2. Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)**

Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR) is an expanded and in-depth performance evaluation conducted by a committee of tenured peers and administered by the chief academic officer. Procedures for conducting an EPPR are detailed in Appendix F.

This policy recognizes that the work of a faculty member is not neatly separated into academic or calendar years. To ensure that performance is evaluated in the context of ongoing work, the period of performance subject to enhanced review is the five most recent annual performance review cycles. Each campus administration must collect and maintain sufficient data regarding annual performance reviews to implement this policy effectively.

An Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review must be initiated when the chief academic officer determines that a faculty member has:

- requested an EPPR, after at least four annual performance review cycles since the last enhanced review (such as a previous EPPR or a review in connection with tenure or promotion);
- received one overall annual performance rating of “Unsatisfactory” (or the campus equivalent for the lowest performance rating); or
- received two overall annual performance ratings of “Needs Improvement” (or the campus equivalent for the next-to-lowest performance rating) during any four consecutive annual performance review cycles.

### **a. Administration of the EPPR by the Chief Academic Officer<sup>1</sup>**

The EPPR process will be administered under the direction and oversight of the campus chief academic officer. As with any performance evaluation, the chief academic officer may overrule a performance rating assigned by a department head or dean during the annual review process. This practice ensures that when an EPPR process is activated by one or more negative performance ratings (III.G.2. above), the chief academic officer is aware of existing concerns.

---

<sup>1</sup> Where indicated in Appendix F, the chief academic officer may delegate tasks associated with the EPPR to a vice provost, associate or assistant vice chancellor for academic affairs, or other appropriate campus academic administrator.

The task of administering the EPPR requires implementation of this policy and the procedures detailed in Appendix F, as well as any additional steps the chief academic officer finds necessary to comply with the policy objectives. For example, the chief academic officer may be required to adapt the implementation of this policy to satisfy legal requirements (such as limitations on disclosure of student information) or respond to unexpected events (such as replacement of a committee member who becomes unable to serve).

b. Peer Review Committee's Charge

The peer review committee is charged to review the information relevant to the faculty member's performance during the review period and to conclude whether or not that performance has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank.

As detailed in Appendix F, the expectations for faculty performance may differ by campus, college, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly-held standards in the discipline or may be stated explicitly in the faculty member's own past annual performance reviews, work assignments, goals or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or college bylaws, the campus faculty handbook, this policy, and in other generally-applicable policies and procedures (for example, fiscal, human resources, safety, research, or information technology policies and procedures).

The peer review committee must reach a conclusion as to whether or not the performance has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member's performance has not met the expectations for the discipline and academic rank, the committee must also recommend either that an EPPR improvement plan be developed as detailed in Appendix F, or that the Chancellor initiate proceedings to consider termination of tenure for Adequate Cause under III.H. below and Appendix B.

The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing, including an explanation for each conclusion or recommendation, and enumerating the vote for any conclusion or recommendation that is not adopted unanimously. The faculty member must have an opportunity to review and respond to the committee's draft report.

All written conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee must be reviewed and considered by the chief academic officer and the Chancellor.

c. Review and Action by the Chancellor

The Chancellor may accept the peer review committee's conclusions and recommendations or make different conclusions in a written explanation provided to the faculty member with copies to the chief academic officer, dean, department head, and members of the peer review

committee. Based on those conclusions, the Chancellor may take further action as deemed appropriate, including (without limitation) actions described in this policy, in the applicable faculty handbook, or in any other policy and procedures generally applicable to faculty.

If the Chancellor concludes (based on the recommendation of a peer review committee or based on independent review of the EPPR materials) that an EPPR improvement plan is warranted, the Chancellor will promptly direct the chief academic officer to oversee development of the plan (Appendix F).

d. Final Review and Action Following Any EPPR Improvement Plan

If an EPPR improvement plan is implemented, the peer review committee must reconvene to review performance under the plan and to decide whether or not performance under the plan satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing, as described in Appendix F. The chief academic officer and the Chancellor must review all conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee. The Chancellor may accept the committee's conclusions and recommendations, provide a written explanation of different conclusions, or take further action deemed appropriate, including (without limitation) actions described in this policy, in the applicable faculty handbook, or any other policy and procedures generally applicable to faculty.

3. Campus Coordination of the APPR and EPPR Review Processes

Because each campus conducts the Annual Performance-and-Planning Review (APPR) on its own timetable, procedures for coordinating the APPR (III.G.1.) and the EPPR (III.G.2.) must also vary by campus. This policy therefore requires that each campus establish (by July 1, 2017) a system for evaluating the ongoing performance of a faculty member whose past performance is being reviewed under the EPPR process.

Such a campus system for coordinating the APPR and the EPPR must be reviewed and approved by the President (or a designee) and Chancellor before implementation. A properly-approved system of coordinated reviews may include an alternate form of annual review (in lieu of the normal APPR) when an EPPR is underway. In such a case, any campus performance evaluation substituted for the APPR must result in an overall performance rating considered for annual salary adjustments (including across-the-board and other raises).

## **Appendix F: Procedures for Conducting the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)**

### **1. Objectives of the Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)**

The EPPR policy and procedures provide a thorough, fair, and transparent process for:

- coordinating peer evaluation of a tenured faculty member's performance across a five-year period;
- facilitating cooperation between a tenured faculty member and administrators in identifying effective strategies to assist the faculty member in meeting the expectations for the relevant discipline and academic rank; and
- distinguishing those unusual situations in which (despite efforts to facilitate improvement) the faculty member's performance fails to satisfy expectations for the discipline and academic rank, and which may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including proceedings to consider termination of tenure.

### **2. Review by the Chief Academic Officer To Determine Whether EPPR is Warranted**

Irrespective of other campus processes or practices through which an annual performance review is finalized, the chief academic officer must review any annual performance evaluation that would result in EPPR.

- If the chief academic officer overrules the performance rating and determines that EPPR is not warranted, the faculty member may choose to proceed with EPPR.
- If the chief academic officer determines that an EPPR is warranted, the chief academic officer should meet promptly with the faculty member to explain the decision and review the EPPR process. The chief academic officer must also provide written notice of this decision (copied to the department head, dean, and faculty senate president) that an EPPR will be conducted.

### **3. Appointment of the Peer Review Committee**

Within 45 days of the written notice that an EPPR will be conducted, the chief academic officer (or designee) must appoint the peer review committee in the manner described below and meet with the committee to review its charge.

Every member of the peer review committee must be tenured; hold the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member undergoing review; and have some familiarity with the relevant performance expectations for faculty in that discipline and academic rank. In the unusual event that an appropriate peer review committee cannot be assembled using

these criteria, the chief academic officer must provide to the faculty member a written explanation for the deviation from the prescribed criteria.

Consistent with the criteria for service stated above, and absent approval by the Board of Trustees to implement some other appointment mechanism, the chief academic officer (or designee) must appoint the peer review committee using the following nomination process:

- the dean nominates one faculty member to serve both as chair and as a voting member of the peer review committee;
- the department head or chair nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed;
- the faculty member undergoing review nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed;
- the faculty senate president nominates three faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed; and
- if a college promotion and tenure committee exists, that committee nominates three actively serving members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed. If no college promotion and tenure committee exists, the faculty member under review selects a department other than his/her own from which the chief academic officer selects a final committee member, consistent with the criteria above.

To ensure diverse perspectives among members of the peer review committee, the chief academic officer should solicit nominations from faculty serving in different roles. When feasible, nominations to the peer review committee should include:

- faculty members whose tenure lies in the same department as the faculty member undergoing review or, in a small department, faculty members who hold tenure in the same college as the faculty member undergoing review;
- at least one faculty member whose tenure resides in a different department than the faculty member undergoing review; and
- at least one faculty member who currently serves (or who served during the most recent cycle) on a college promotion and tenure review committee, if such a committee exists.

#### **4. Collection of Records for Review by the Peer Review Committee**

The chief academic officer (or designee) must collect the following records with respect to the faculty member under review:

- all annual performance reviews for the past five annual performance review cycles, including materials submitted by the faculty member (or an administrator) or developed as part of the evaluation process;
- written performance expectations, which may have been established in the past five annual performance reviews, in department or college bylaws, in the faculty handbook, or in Board of Trustees, fiscal, human resources, research, safety, or information technology policies or procedures; and
- any work assignments, goals, or other plans (however identified) that were described in previous performance evaluations during the review period.

The faculty member undergoing review may submit additional written materials relevant to the review period for the committee's consideration. Such materials must be submitted to the chief academic officer (or designee) for distribution to the committee. The peer review committee may also request that the chief academic officer (or designee) collect and provide additional written materials. Reasonable requests for relevant records will be honored when permitted by law and University policy.

## **5. Conclusions and Recommendations by the Peer Review Committee**

The peer review committee is charged to review the available performance information and to conclude (based on that information) whether or not performance during the review period has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. This review should be completed (and written report drafted) within 75 days from the chief academic officer's charge to the peer review committee.

*Interviews* – The peer review committee may conduct a reasonable number of interviews in person or electronically. If the committee chooses to conduct interviews, both the faculty member undergoing review and the administrator who assigned the negative rating(s) must be given the opportunity to be interviewed. All interviews must be conducted separately. Unavailability of the faculty member or administrator for an interview does not constitute grounds for an extension of time to complete the EPPR.

*Voting* – Voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. No member of the committee may abstain or recuse him/herself from voting. All conclusions and recommendations are adopted upon the vote of a simple majority, except a recommendation that the Chancellor initiate tenure termination proceedings, which requires the support of at least four members of the peer review committee.

### **a. Conclusions Regarding Performance and Recommended Action(s)**

All conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee must be made in writing, with copies to all parties (faculty member, department head, dean, and chief academic officer). Minority reports may be attached. While the committee is not permitted

to share written materials directly with the faculty senate, the faculty member under review remains free to do so.

Based on the judgment of its members, the peer review committee must conclude either:

- (1) that the performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank; or
- (2) that the performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. In such a case, the committee must recommend either:
  - that an EPPR improvement plan be developed and implemented; or
  - by a vote of at least four committee members, that the Chancellor should initiate proceedings to consider termination of tenure based on Adequate Cause (Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service) as defined in III.H. of this policy and the procedures detailed in Appendix B.

b. Review and Responses to the Peer Review Committee's Report

The committee's written conclusions and recommendations must be distributed to the faculty member, department head, and dean for simultaneous review, who must submit any written responses to the chief academic officer within 14 days.

c. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Chief Academic Officer

The chief academic officer will review the committee's report and all timely written responses and will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Within 28 days of the distribution of the peer review committee's report (14 days for review and comment by others and 14 days for independent review by the chief academic officer), the chief academic officer must provide to the Chancellor copies of the committee's report, all timely responses to the report, and any additional conclusions or recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent review of the material. The entire report, including any materials added by the faculty member, department head, dean, and chief academic officer, must be copied to the faculty member, peer review committee, department head, and dean.

6. Review and Action by the Chancellor

The Chancellor will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member's performance and must provide to the faculty member (copied to the department head, dean, chief academic officer, and members of the peer review committee) a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions, or further actions to be taken.

If the Chancellor concludes that the performance under review has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the EPPR process is concluded. In doing so, the Chancellor may overrule previous performance ratings and may adjust the faculty member's salary to reflect any across-the-board raises.

If the Chancellor concludes that the performance under review does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the Chancellor may take further action as deemed appropriate. For example (without limitation):

- The Chancellor may require that an EPPR improvement plan be implemented for a period of up to 18 months, as further described below.
- The Chancellor may propose disciplinary action, up to and including proceedings to consider tenure termination based on Adequate Cause (Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service) as defined in III.H. of this policy and the procedures detailed in Appendix B.

## **7. Development and Implementation of an Improvement Plan (When Applicable)**

### **a. Written Notice to All Parties**

If the Chancellor concludes that an EPPR improvement plan should be developed, the Chancellor must promptly instruct the chief academic officer to develop and implement an improvement plan using the process detailed below. The chief academic officer must promptly notify in writing the faculty member under review that the Chancellor has determined that an EPPR improvement plan must be implemented (with copies to the department head, dean, and peer review committee). Only one improvement plan may be offered to a faculty member during a given EPPR process; however, the EPPR process may be implemented more than once during a faculty member's career. An EPPR improvement plan may extend no more than 18 months from the time it is implemented by the chief academic officer.

### **b. Development of the EPPR Improvement Plan**

The department head is responsible for drafting the EPPR improvement plan in close collaboration with the peer review committee, dean, and chief academic officer. In drafting the improvement plan, the department head should attempt to address any written concerns raised by the faculty member during the relevant annual review cycles.

Within 30 days of notice that an improvement plan must be developed, the department head is expected to produce a plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the peer review committee. Once such an improvement plan is developed, the chief academic officer shall forward the proposed plan to the faculty member.

If the department head fails to produce within 30 days an improvement plan supported by the chief academic officer, dean, and majority of the peer review committee, then the committee must assume responsibility for drafting an improvement plan. In such a case, the committee must complete the plan within 14 additional days. Upon approval by a majority of the peer review committee, the proposed plan must be provided to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval.

In either case, the chief academic officer must ensure that an improvement plan acceptable to the chief academic officer, dean, and majority of the peer review committee is developed and must send the proposed plan to the faculty member for review and response. The faculty member under review must be given one opportunity to review and respond to the proposed improvement plan (within 14 days). The peer review committee must review and consider the faculty member's response, including any modifications requested by the faculty member (within another 14 days). In its discretion, the peer review committee may revise the proposed plan after considering the faculty member's response. The committee must then forward the proposed improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and, if approved, implementation (with copies to the dean, department head, and faculty member).

d. Committee Review after an EPPR Improvement Plan

At the end of the time allotted for the EPPR improvement plan, the peer review committee must reconvene to review performance under the plan, and to determine whether or not such performance (in the context of the EPPR review period) has satisfied expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. The peer review committee must provide a written report of its conclusions and recommendations to the faculty member, department head, and dean, who may respond in writing within 14 days.

The chief academic officer must review the committee's report and any timely written responses and must independently evaluate performance under the improvement plan. The chief academic officer must then submit the reconvened committee's report, all written responses, and his/her own conclusions and recommendations to the Chancellor, with copies to the faculty member, peer review committee, department head, and dean.

e. Chancellor's Review and Action after an EPPR Improvement Plan

The Chancellor will make an independent evaluation of the performance under the EPPR improvement plan (in the context of the EPPR review period) and must provide to the faculty member (copied to the department head, dean, chief academic officer, and members of the peer review committee) a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions, or further actions to be taken.

## **8. Timeline for Conducting the EPPR**

All EPPR deadlines are counted in calendar days rather than business days, except when the last day of the time period falls during a holiday or administrative closure lasting five business days or longer (such as the administrative closure between fall and spring semesters or an extended weather-related closure). The following table summarizes the key events and deadlines in the EPPR process.

| Event begins  | Days | Event ends   |
|---|------|--|
| Written notice from the chief academic officer that EPPR is warranted   | 45   | Chief academic officer charges the peer review committee   |
| Chief academic officer charges the peer review committee  | 75   | Committee report is distributed for review by the faculty member, department head, and dean  |
| Committee report is distributed for review by the faculty member, department head, and dean   | 14   | Faculty member, department head, and dean submit written responses to the chief academic officer   |
| Chief academic officer reviews timely responses to the report and makes an independent evaluation   | 14   | Chief academic officer submits to the Chancellor the committee's report, all timely responses, and any additional conclusions and recommendations based on the chief academic officer's independent evaluation |
| If the Chancellor requires implementation of an EPPR improvement plan, the chief academic officer provides written notice to all parties  | 30   | Department head submits to the chief academic officer a proposed improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the peer review committee                                   |
| If the department head fails to produce an improvement plan supported by the dean, chief academic officer, and a majority of the committee, then the peer review committee assumes responsibility for drafting a plan | 14   | Peer review committee submits the proposed improvement plan to the dean and chief academic officer for review and approval   |
| Upon approval by the chief academic officer, the proposed improvement plan is sent to the faculty member for review   | 14   | Faculty member submits to the peer review committee any written response (including any requested modifications to the improvement plan)   |
| Peer review committee considers faculty member's response and may revise the proposed improvement plan  | 14   | Peer review committee submits the proposed improvement plan to the chief academic officer for review and approval  |
| Chief academic officer reviews the proposed plan, responds to the committee as needed, and approves a final improvement plan  | 14   | Chief academic officer sends the approved plan to the faculty member and others for implementation   |

On a case-by-case basis, the chief academic officer (or designee) may approve a written request from the peer review committee for an extension of time to complete the initial review. Only one extension may be granted to the peer review committee during a single EPPR, and the chief academic officer (or designee) will determine the length of the extension.

*Concurrent Appeals or Grievances* – While appeal of an annual performance rating (or other procedure) may overlap in time with the five-year review period, the EPPR is purposefully different from the annual performance review process. To the extent provided under the applicable faculty handbook or other campus policies or practices, the faculty member may choose to initiate or maintain an appeal of the most recent annual performance rating while EPPR is underway. Any appeal or other process must be conducted without interference or influence from the EPPR, and vice versa. Faculty senate leaders should take care to ensure the integrity of all procedures by confirming that no person serves in multiple proceedings related to the same faculty member. Except as may be required by law (for example, under regulatory requirements or a judicial order) any such appeal, grievance, or other University process must proceed simultaneously with the EPPR and must have no impact on the timing or procedures described in this policy.

**9. Phased Implementation of this Policy**

If approved by the Board of Trustees on October 14, 2016, this policy becomes effective on July 1, 2017. Any faculty member who is engaged in a Cumulative Performance Review (CPR) on October 14, 2016 must complete the CPR process under the then-applicable CPR policy. Otherwise, the following implementation schedule applies.

| Date of annual performance review meeting | Overall rating of Needs Improvement (or campus equivalent)   | Overall rating of Unsatisfactory (or campus equivalent) |
|---|--|---|
| On or before June 30, 2017                | CPR policy applies   | CPR policy applies                                      |
| July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018              | Performance ratings are reviewed by the chief academic officer, who decides whether CPR or EPPR should be applied. | EPPR policy applies                                     |
| July 1, 2018 or later                     | EPPR policy applies  | EPPR policy applies                                     |