

## Academic Affairs Handbook

The following represents the new language in the Academic Affairs Handbook that is reflective of the new policy language related to post-tenure review and annual evaluations. These modifications will require some renumbering of existing handbook sections.

### 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems

#### BOR Policies:

- 3.2.1 Faculty Membership
  - 3.2.1.1 Corps of Instruction
  - 3.2.1.2 Administrative Officers
- 8.3.5.1 Annual Evaluation
- 8.3.5.1 Pre-tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.7 Tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.6 Promotion Evaluation
- 8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.8 Non-Tenure Track Personnel

The USG faculty evaluation system is comprised of annual evaluation, three-year pre-tenure evaluation, tenure evaluation, promotion evaluation and post-tenure evaluation. For faculty hired as a lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, or as an academic professional, the evaluation system is comprised of annual evaluations and promotion evaluation.

Each institution is responsible for establishing definitive policies, processes, and stated criteria for faculty evaluation that are aligned with the mission, statutes, and academic organization of the institution and are consistent with Regents' policies. These policies, processes, and stated criteria must incorporate appropriate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom. Institutional performance criteria must be identified and defined at each level of evaluation and must be stated in writing and available in the institution's faculty handbook posted on an institution's website. All changes to performance criteria must be updated in the faculty handbook in a timely fashion. These updates must be done in advance of the next review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents (e.g. pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure).

#### **Policies, Processes, and Reporting**

Each institution must have written and published faculty evaluation review policies, processes, and criteria for faculty that are consistent with Board of Regents policy and USG guidelines and approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution should develop templates for annual review, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure applications. These templates should provide clear guidance to what the faculty members need to submit. Tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and faculty outside of the tenure process should be evaluated based upon their academic discipline-specific criteria, and the institutional evaluation rubric, consistent with the system level review policies and guidelines detailed in this handbook. All USG annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following Likert scale:

- 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 5 – Exemplary

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the above Likert Scale. Annually, each institution must submit information regarding faculty annual reviews and PTR review outcomes to the Board of Regents. The reporting guidelines, structure, and timelines will be disseminated by the USG Academic Chief Officer.

### Training

The USG will develop and deliver system-wide professional development trainings and resources for academic administrators who supervise faculty. Professional development training sessions and resources will be posted on MomentumU@USG, the USG virtual professional development platform. Each institution is responsible for ensuring that academic administrators are properly trained for all levels of evaluation as outlined in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution must develop a robust annual professional development plan for academic administrators and faculty to ensure adherence to Board Policy procedures outlined in this handbook. In addition, the institution is responsible to provide professional development to faculty who serve on tenure and post tenure review committees.

### Auditing Institutional Plans and Processes

Periodically, the USG Division of Internal Audits will perform institutional audits of annual, pre-tenure, tenure, promotional and post tenure (PTR) policies and procedures, for compliance with Board of Regents policies. The institutional audit reports and identified issues will be shared with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, and the Board of Regents Committees on Internal Audit, Risk, and Compliance, and Academic Affairs.

While the Board of Regents has delegated authority for tenure decisions to institution presidents, if an institution is adjudged to be carrying out its faculty review process in an insufficiently rigorous manner the Board of Regents may move the authority to award tenure to the Board level until institutional processes have been remediated. (BOR 8.3.7.1 Faculty)

### Review Principles and Guidelines

Each institution should use the following Review Principles and Guidelines to develop their institution-specific evaluation systems. The institutional evaluation system must be approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer.

- Campuses will create clear and transparent assessment criteria and rubrics for faculty performance in each assessed campus category. Evaluation and assessment criteria must align to the mission and values of the institution. Departments may further develop institutional assessment criteria and rubrics specific to their discipline.
- Criteria should be developed for each stage of a faculty member's career from untenured Assistant Professor, through various levels of promotion, to stages of tenured Full Professor. Analogous criteria should also be developed for faculty who serve outside the tenure structure. These criteria will provide sufficient guidance to assess whether a faculty member's performance is appropriate to their stage of professional career development at their institution, college/school, and in their department.
- The development of these criteria should reflect the involvement of the institution through its academic affairs organization, colleges, departments, faculties, and should be approved through the institution's faculty governance processes and procedures.
- Both qualitative and quantitative assessments are acceptable; however, all methods of evaluation should strive for objectivity and reduce subjectivity as much as possible.
- The measure of "Effectiveness in Academic Assigned Duties" should include assessments of both instructional quality and quality learning. Criteria should include measures such as an assessment of student perception, evidence of effective student learning, the use of continuous improvement methodologies, peer assessment of pedagogy, an evaluation of curricular design, quality of assessment and course construction, and the use of established learning science methodologies.

- Evaluation of the Student Success component will involve an assessment of the faculty member's involvement in activities inside and outside the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement for all learners. These aspects may include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities identified by the institution to deepen student learning. Examples include, but are not limited to, Centers for Teaching and Learning, Chancellor's Learning Scholars, Faculty Learning Communities and MomentumU@USG.
- Evaluation of Research and Scholarship will take place within the context and mission of their department at that institution, whether within the faculty member's discipline area, or as part of their scholarship of teaching and learning.
- The institution will adjudge the Professional Service component by considering activities that include Institutional Service – such as various forms of active engagement, committee work, faculty senate activities, and major institution and/or system initiatives; Service to the Discipline – discipline-related service in local, regional, national, and international organizations; and community involvement.

### Annual Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated annually by their appropriate supervisor as defined by the institution against the minimum criteria listed in the BOR Policy 8.3.5.1 and BOR Policy 8.3.7.3. The annual evaluation will encompass teaching; undergraduate/graduate student success activities; research/scholarship/creative activity or academic achievement; professional service to the institution or community; and continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, college or school and department. Institutions must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage as noted in the abovementioned Likert scale.

- The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the annual evaluation. The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and his/her progression towards achieving future milestones.
- The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he/she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will be given a specific period (e.g., 10 working days) to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
- The appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 working days from the faculty member's rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the official personnel records. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review.
- If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year. The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. This will become part of the official personnel records.

### Third Year Pre-Tenure Review (On Track Not Tenured)

Faculty who are employed on an annual tenure track contract will undergo a third-year pre-tenure review. Individual institutions will choose whether this review will serve in lieu of the annual evaluation or will be in addition to the annual evaluation. The purpose of the third-year pre-tenure review is to provide a rigorous analysis and detailed feedback of the faculty member's body of work in the areas of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service towards tenure. The institution is responsible for clearly identifying the policies and procedures for third year pre-tenure reviews. This process should at least include a review from the department chair, peers, college/school wide tenure committee (if used) and the Dean. The previous annual evaluations must be part of the review. The overall

evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion (BOR 8.3.5.1).

- The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the third-year pre-tenure review, as outline in the institutional guidelines.
- The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's third year pre-tenure review. A written report of the faculty member's progression towards achieving future milestones of tenure will be provided to the faculty member after the conference.
- The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he/she has been apprised of the content of the third-year pre-tenure evaluation.
- The faculty member will be given a specific period (e.g., 10 working days) to respond in writing to the third year written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
- The appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made because of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 working days from the faculty member's rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will become a part of the official records and is not subject to discretionary review.
- If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member with feedback from any committee that participated in the third-year review. The PRP must be approved by the Dean of the academic unit. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records.

Renumber **Award of Tenure** as 4.5 (Keep Current Language)

Renumber **Award of Promotion** as 4.6 (Keep Current Language)

#### 4.7 Post-Tenure Review

##### **Post-Tenure Review**

The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.

*Timeline:* All tenured faculty who have rank and tenure with an academic unit must undergo post-tenure review five years after the award of tenure and subsequently every five years unless it is interrupted by a further review for promotion to a higher academic rank (Associate/Full Professor) or academic leadership promotion (e.g. department chair, Dean, Associate Provost).

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for a post-tenure review before the five-year time limit. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early post-tenure reviews should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since they were last evaluated for tenure or a previous post-tenure review, whichever was most recent. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next post-tenure review will be five years from the voluntary PTR post-tenure review date. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year PTR review date remains in place.

*Areas of Evaluation:* The evaluation must address the faculty's accomplishments related to teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service. Annual reviews encompassing the previous five years for the 5-year span must be incorporated in the post-tenure review processes. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the institution through their teaching, student success activities, scholarship/research, and service. Contributions should be dated from previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous 5-year period.

#### *Outcomes & Consequences of Post Tenure Review*

The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements. Each institution will prescribe how the review results will be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.

In the event of a post-tenure review that does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the faculty member's appropriate supervisor(s) and faculty member will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the PTR committee based around the deficiencies found by the committee. Consistent with the developmental intent of the PTR, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the post-tenure review. The PIP must contain clearly defined goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, available resources and supports, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. The PIP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable with the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs. Formal meetings for assessing progress on the PIP should be scheduled no less than twice per semester during the fall and spring semesters. The institution should create appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal an unfavorable post-tenure review as outlined below.

The assessment of the PIP will take the place of that year's annual review. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies, or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation, within one year subjects the faculty member to disciplinary actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The institution will follow appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal the final assessment of their PIP and the resulting remedial actions as outlined below.

The appropriate supervisor must meet with each faculty member to discuss the results of PTR. Each faculty member must receive a letter documenting the summary of the findings of the PTR. In the event of an unsuccessful PTR the letter must also include next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory. The faculty member can provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document however no action is required by the appropriate supervisor.

#### **Corrective Post Tenure Review**

A faculty member evaluated as deficient in any one of the elements of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and/or service for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review. Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area; but could be a different area from one year to the next. This review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. The faculty member will follow the institution's guidelines and procedures for post tenure review. If the outcome of the Corrective Post-Tenure Review is successful, the faculty member will reset the post-tenure review clock. If the outcome of a corrective post tenure review does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the same process for an unsuccessful PTR will be followed. The institution should follow appropriate due-process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal a corrective post-tenure review as outlined below.

#### **Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review or an Unsuccessful Corrective Post-Tenure Review**

If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials and allowing the faculty member an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the performance improvement plan, the department chair and dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or has

refused to engage reasonably in the process), the department chair and dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. Upon request by the faculty member, the PTR committee will review the materials that attest to performance improvement plan progress and the proposed remedial action and make their recommendation.

The faculty member has 10 business days from receiving the recommendation of the dean/dept. chair to request the PTR committee review. Upon request to review the recommended action by the faculty member, further due process will include the following:

1. The PTR committee will review the recommendation of the department chair and dean. The PTR committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The recommendation of the PTR committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The PTR committee will issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member within 20 business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
2. Within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the PTR committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him or her of the decision.
3. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within 5 business days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President's final decision shall be made within 10 business days and should notify the faculty member of his or her decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents' Policy.
4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.
5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to Board policy on Applications for Discretionary Review (6.26).

### **Academic Administrators**

*Academic administrators who hold faculty rank and are tenured at the institution aligned with an academic unit will receive an annual review by their appropriate supervisor and will undergo a comprehensive evaluation, including a 360° feedback assessment every five years. Each institution should specify the process and procedures for a comprehensive evaluation of academic administrators. It is intended that an academic administrator's annual and comprehensive evaluation include a review of traditional faculty activities (teaching, research, student success, and service) that align with the responsibilities of the administrator.*

### **Elements of the Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) and the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)**

There are two different plans for addressing faculty performance: a ***performance remediation plan*** and a ***performance improvement plan***. For faculty who do not meet annual performance expectations a *performance remediation plan* is put in place. The purpose of this plan is to scaffold faculty growth and development, strengthen tenure and promotion possibilities. The second, a *performance improvement plan*, is developed subsequent to an unfavorable PTR or corrective PTR. The components of the PIP and the PRP plans must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes,
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken,
3. A timetable,
4. Available resources and supports,
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

### *Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)*

The Performance Remediation Plan is used to document faculty deficiencies based on the outcomes from the annual review. The purpose of the PRP is designed to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs or Human Resources wherever the permanent faculty files are housed. Two meetings during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. Consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting. Each institution should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

### *Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)*

The Performance Improvement Plan is used to document deficiencies based on an unfavorable Post Tenure Review. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs or Human Resources wherever the permanent faculty files are housed. Two meetings during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member's progress will be determined by the department chair and dean after taking into account feedback from a committee of faculty colleagues. Each institution should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

### **Interruptions to the Post-Tenure Review Timeline**

Institutions should follow existing processes to allow faculty the opportunity to pause the post-tenure review timeline as are already in place at the institution.

## Implementation Process and Timeline

Institutions are approaching the process to make changes to their institutional policies in a variety of ways. In order to support the various processes, the USG will have one submission deadline for all revisions with two status updates in April and in September:

<b>Submission Deadlines</b>	<b>Dates</b>
Status Report on Changes to PTR and Annual Review Policies	April 1, 2022
Status Report on Changes to PTR and Annual Review Policies	September 1, 2022
Institutions submit updated PTR and Annual Review policies to USG Chief Academic Officer for approval	No later than October 17, 2022*
USO staff review institutional submissions and provide feedback	No later than November 18, 2022
Institutions take final PTR policies through the formal shared governance process	November and December 2022
<b><i>Institutional Policy Implementation</i></b>	
Annual Reviews	The new annual review should be utilized during the first full cycle following its adoption. For example if an institution evaluates on a calendar year cycle, 2023 will be the first year the faculty member will be evaluated on the new standards. If the institution evaluates on the academic calendar, the next cycle will be AY2023-2024.
Post-Tenure Review	No later than AY 2023-2024*
<b><i>Reporting to the Board of Regents</i></b>	
Preliminary Report	August 2022
Annual Review	August 2023
PTR	August 2024
<b><i>Training and Development</i></b>	
Opportunities for institution collaboration/Q & A	January 2022
Department Chairs, Deans, Academic leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using the new annual evaluation process for development</li> <li>Recognizing and eliminating bias in the annual review process</li> </ul>	February and March 2022 January every year following
*We encourage institutions to send forward annual review and PTR plans as they are ready for USG review.	
Note: Faculty who go up for post-tenure review during the first two years of implementation should be given flexibility based on the adoption of new expectations.	