



**OVERVIEW OF THE NEW UT BOARD OF TRUSTEES
POLICIES GOVERNING ACADEMIC FREEDOM,
RESPONSIBILITY, AND TENURE (BT0006)**

*Presentation by Beauvais Lyons
UTK Faculty Senate, April 2, 2018*

ETTR Enhanced Tenure=Track Review (p.7). The requirement that all tenure-track faculty have a more extensive review of their dossier in year 3-4. This policy is the current norm at UTK and UTIA.

APPR Annual Planning and Performance Review (p.10). The required annual review compiled at UTK and UTIA using ELEMENTS and other supporting documents that is evaluated by the department head, the dean and the chief academic officer. For UTK this is conducted each fall based on the prior three years of the academic calendar. For UTIA this is conducted each spring based on the prior three years of the regular calendar. Faculty performance rankings are assigned through this process. This is a fundamental and ongoing component of the review of both tenure-track and tenured faculty. This policy is the current norm at UTK and UTIA.

EPPR Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (pp. 12-15). First implemented in 2017, this process is similar to the Cumulative Performance Review (CPR) policy used for almost two decades. EPPR involves quicker triggers, so that it is initiated based on one “unsatisfactory” review, or two “needs improvement” over a four-year period. Appendix E addresses the composition of the review committee and procedures. It is currently in effect, but the UTK Faculty Handbook needs to be revised to incorporate this policy in its most current form.

PPPR Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (p.12). This new policy will need to be developed by each campus for board approval by their November 2018 meeting. It requires “every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years.”

CPRAPR Comprehensive Performance Review Based on Findings of an Academic Program Review (p.16). The policy states “Based on the findings of an academic program review, the President may recommend to the Board of Trustees procedures under which the campus administration will conduct comprehensive performance reviews of tenured and non-tenured faculty in the program.” As this is not included with the March 23rd resolution, it would appear that there is not a specific timeline for the development of any campus-level policies or procedures.

- Appendix A Procedures for the Consideration and Grant of Tenure (pp. 20-22)
- Appendix B Termination Procedures for Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service. (pp. 21-31)
- Appendix C Termination Procedures for Misconduct. (p.32-38)
- Appendix D Exemption to Policy Requiring Full-Time Status for Eligibility for Tenure (p. 39)
- Appendix E Procedures for Conducting EPPR (pp. 40-49)

Other Policy Changes of Note:

- There have been some small changes to the EPPR process in Appendix E, mostly involving voting processes on review committees.
- While one can come up for early consideration, six-year probationary periods will be the norm for all tenure-track hires;
- Regular tenure cases will be decided by the UT President;
- All early and expedited tenure cases will be decided by the UT Board of Trustees.

Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review

.....Therefore, the President shall establish, with Board approval, procedures for each campus under which every tenured faculty member shall receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years. As a minimum, the procedures for this periodic review shall: (1) provide for a peer review committee internal to the campus composed of tenured faculty members at the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member being reviewed, some of whom hold appointments in the same department as the faculty member being reviewed and some of whom do not; (2) provide for external reviews to be solicited when deemed necessary by the peer review committee or the dean; and (3) provide for appropriate staggering of reviews to avoid excessive administrative burden at any given time.

Context: Based on the small number of faculty who receive rankings below “meet expectations” through Annual Planning and Performance Reviews (APPR), the UT Board of Trustees believes that annual rankings of faculty are not rigorous enough. In consultation with UT President Joe DiPietro, each campus is to develop a Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review process for approval at the June 2018 Board of Trustees meeting.

Need to Define the Problem: I have asked UT Vice-President Linda Martin to provide the Provosts and the University Faculty Council with the following information to assist in policy development:

- Historical data on APPR rankings by campus, college and academic unit showing the number of faculty assigned to each ranking category for the past six years.
- Data on the number of Cumulative Performance Reviews (CPR) that were initiated for each campus over this same period showing the number of faculty who (1) returned to productivity, (2) chose to retire or leave the university, or (3) resulted in termination.
- Examples of “best practices” of periodic post-tenure review policies from other universities.

Ensuring the Clarity and Consistency of Annual Performance and Planning Reviews

Chief academic officers on each campus should complete an audit to confirm that all college and unit bylaws have appropriate performance criteria by academic rank.

Each campus should establish an annual comprehensive department head training program with an emphasis on faculty evaluations.

Evaluations of department heads should provide an opportunity for faculty to give input into the effectiveness of the annual evaluations.

Composition and Time-line for the Campus-Level PPPR Policy Drafting Task Forces

The Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Senate President from each campus should convene a task force comprised of faculty and administrators to develop and propose a campus level policy with input from the Faculty Senates and academic deans. According to the resolution passed, campuses will need to complete the development of a PPPR policy prior to the November 2018 BOT meeting. As such, it will be advisable to start this process before the end of the spring term with work to be done over the summer.

Guiding Questions to Inform the New Policy on Each Campus

The PPPR Policy Drafting Task Forces should address the following questions when drafting a PPPR Policy:

What materials should the review be based upon to ensure effective and efficient use of effort for the faculty member under review?

What is the best size and composition of PPPR committees to ensure appropriate disciplinary expertise and effective use of faculty and administrative effort?

What process will be used for the selection of faculty members conducting reviews?

What form of evaluation should there be to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching?

How does the policy address cases where the faculty member under review is determined to be performing at an overall ranking that is higher than the ones assigned through the APPR process?

How does the policy address cases where the faculty member under review is determined to be performing at an overall ranking that is less than the ones assigned through the APPR process?

When would a review involve the solicitation of reviewers from outside of the university?

How will standard rights of appeal apply if a faculty member disagrees with the review committee's findings?

How do the reviews ensure that there is clarity, consistency and candor in the APPR process?

How do the reviews support improved performance by department heads as well as inform best practices in annual evaluations?

How do the reviews provide both formative and summative input for the faculty member under review?

As the reviews involve personnel information, what provisions are made to ensure the confidentiality of the reviews? Might this be a case for having a campus-level review committee with appropriate disciplinary expertise?

Could raises or bonuses be allocated to top performing faculty reviewed through this process?

Should the name of the PPPR system be changed to reflect a commitment to both formative and summative objectives? One option proposed has been Faculty Accomplishments and Accountability Reviews (FAAR).

The next meeting of the University Faculty Council will
take place on Wednesday April 18, 2018

DISCUSSION – NEXT STEPS