

Tenure

Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members

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 Department Head 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. College and department bylaws should make clear the contexts, criteria, and procedures to be followed for these reviews, including specific evaluation criteria for each level of performance. 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.

Performance ratings for annual reviews shall be as follows, and campus, college, and department bylaws must clarify the means and metric for each department head to employ in conducting these reviews:

1. Exceeds Expectations for Rank--eligible for significant merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and department fiscal situations;
2. Meets Expectations for Rank--eligible for minimum merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and department fiscal situations;
3. Needs improvement for Rank--not eligible for merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment and required to implement an Annual Review Improvement Plan (see below); and
4. Unsatisfactory for Rank--not eligible for any salary adjustment and required to implement an Annual Review Improvement Plan (see below).

Within 30 days of the annual review, any faculty member 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) noted as Needs Improvement for Rank or Unsatisfactory for Rank.

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:

1. a faculty member whose annual review is Unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years;
2. 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:

1. Satisfies Expectations for Rank
2. 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:

1. 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

2. 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
3. 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:

1. that the faculty member's performance is Satisfies Expectations for Rank and no other action need be taken at this time; or
2. 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
3. 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).