

FACULTY EVALUATION

ANNUAL AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS

New Academic
Administrators
Workshop

August 16, 2012

BACKGROUND

- **January 1, 1998** – Texas Education Code amended to require comprehensive evaluation of tenured faculty every six years
- **Regents' Rule 31102** adopted to implement legislation
- **HOP 3.14** – local policy
 - Two rating categories - Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory
 - No linkage between post-tenure review and review for possible dismissal

RR 31102 – EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

- Modified in February 2012
- “Periodic evaluation is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom.”
- Expands significantly on existing policy

RR 31102 - KEY CHANGES

- Adds details for annual review process
- Establishes four categories of evaluation for both annual and comprehensive review
 - Exceeds expectations
 - Meets expectations
 - Fails to meet expectations
 - Unsatisfactory
- Establishes a more explicit link between evaluation and possible disciplinary action

KEY PRINCIPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION

- Policies strongly affirm the quality of UT faculty, the value of tenure, and the positive function of post tenure evaluation
- Strongly affirm safeguards to protect due process and academic freedom

KEY PRINCIPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION

- Individual faculty have the right to:
 - provide input during the process
 - receive institutional support for improvement
 - (e.g. teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, mentoring, etc.)
 - invoke standard appeal procedures
 - meet with the review committee
 - submit additional materials

KEY PRINCIPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION

- The review and evaluative process will be determined and overseen by departmental faculty personnel committees or smaller groups determined by them
- Chairs and deans may not override or ignore committee evaluations

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate
- Provide assurance that faculty are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas
- Form the basis for determining merit raises, honors, awards, and other forms of recognition

KEY STEPS IN THE PROCESS

- Assess materials focusing on individual merit and record of teaching, scholarship, and service
- Determine review category
- Communicate evaluation results
- If unsatisfactory, establish development plan
- Monitor

EVALUATION SCOPE

- Focus on individual merit and record of teaching, scholarship, and service

- Materials to be assessed:
 - Annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR)
 - Current CV
 - Student evaluations of teaching, including all written student comments
 - Additional materials, as available, such as:
 - Peer teaching observations (required for comprehensive review)
 - Any documentation directly related to the record of teaching, scholarship and service
 - Information submitted by the faculty member

CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

■ Exceeds expectations

- A clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline, unit, and faculty rank

■ Meets expectations

- Level of accomplishment normally expected

■ Fails to meet expectations

- A failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction

■ Unsatisfactory

- Failing to meet expectations in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence

ANNUAL REVIEW

- Overseen by departmental budget council, extended budget council, or executive committee
- Applies to all active faculty, tenured and non-tenured
- Faculty on approved, non-academic leave without pay for the entire year are not subject to review that year
- Not required for tenured faculty who are undergoing a six-year comprehensive review

ANNUAL EVALUATION RESULTS

- The rating assigned shall be an aggregate based on overall judgment of the faculty member's activities
- Communicate results to faculty member
 - In writing
 - State the evaluation category
 - Advise of any areas that need improvement
 - If unsatisfactory, include a brief statement to identify the area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and basis for the evaluation

ANNUAL - UNSATISFACTORY

- Faculty member to work with department chair to establish a written development plan – within 30 days
 - Goal of improving performance to an acceptable level
 - Include tangible goals for measuring success

- Department shall monitor progress during following year

- Two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings – may be subject to
 - Comprehensive review or
 - Disciplinary action
 - Prior to taking action, faculty member shall be advised of right to appeal or grieve

COMPREHENSIVE SIX-YEAR REVIEW

- Conducted by committee of tenured faculty and overseen by budget council, extended budget council, or executive committee
- For joint positions, the primary department will be the locus unless the faculty member chooses to designate a joint department of equal or greater percent time

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

- Applies to each tenured member of the faculty
- Evaluation may be deferred when review period coincides with
 - Approved leave
 - Comprehensive promotion review, or
 - Appointment to an endowed position
- Deferral may not extend beyond one year
- Six-year period starts at
 - Time of hire into tenured position
 - Award of tenure via promotion process
 - Restarts at promotion to full professor

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member
- Contributions may vary widely, e.g.:
 - 100% administrative duties
 - Teaching in more than one program
 - Substantial duties in advising students
- Consider information from others familiar with substantial contributions in other departments or programs, if provided

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION RESULTS

- The rating assigned shall be an aggregate based on overall judgment of the faculty member's activities
- Before submitting evaluation:
 - Notify the faculty member of the results
 - Provide opportunity for faculty member to meet with committee, submit additional material, and comment on the findings
- Written comments submitted by the faculty will be included with the final evaluation
- Results are communicated to faculty member, chair and dean in writing
 - State the evaluation category
 - Advise of any areas that need improvement

COMPREHENSIVE - UNSATISFACTORY

- Identify the area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the evaluation
- Do not speculate on “reasons why” the performance is unsatisfactory
- Establish faculty development and support plan:
 - Follow-up schedule (with specific dates), benchmarks, and tangible goals for measuring improved performance
 - University resources for providing appropriate support
 - Who will monitor implementation of the plan and support the faculty member through the process (e.g., a faculty mentor)

COLLEGE-LEVEL PEER REVIEW OF UNSATISFACTORY EVALUATION

- A more intensive review may be initiated by the dean or faculty member
- Committee is appointed whose membership is:
 - Representative of the college
 - Selected based on objectivity and academic strength
 - Same or higher rank as faculty member being reviewed
 - Different from that of the Promotion and Tenure committee
- May request additional information from the faculty member
- Provide faculty member with opportunity to meet
- Report findings within three months

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW TIMETABLE

- **By March 31**
 - Notify faculty member of intent to review the following Fall. Provide at least six months notice
- **By May 31**
 - Provide previous annual reports and other materials to be assessed to faculty member for review
- **October – December**
 - Conduct the review
- **By February 1**
 - Communicate final results to faculty member, department chair, and dean
- **By February 28**
 - Where appropriate, dean appoints college-level review committee
- **By May 31**
 - College-level review committee reports findings

DEVELOPMENTAL SUPPORT PLAN

- Required for unsatisfactory evaluations
- May be established for any faculty members whose performance indicates they would benefit
- If a plan is established, must be monitored for sufficient improvement

DISCIPLINARY ACTION

If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including termination, may be initiated in accordance with due process procedures of the Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31008 and Handbook of Operating Procedures Section 3.18

AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

Notwithstanding the review process, department chairs and deans of non-departmentalized colleges and schools are responsible for the academic quality of their instructional programs and activities and are expected to act when necessary to insure the quality of their programs

APPEALS

- Faculty retain right to avail themselves of normal appeals channels
 - Next higher administrative level
 - Grievance committee
 - Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCA FR)
 - Procedural irregularities
 - Academic freedom violations
 - Faculty Ombudsperson