

Be it resolved to modify the Annual Review policy (403.3) (approved 4/20/1990, modified by FS_2017_4 and FS_2018_20) (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion),

1 **I. Annual Faculty Review**

2 An annual review of the performance of all full time faculty members shall be made on the basis
3 of assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures required herein.

4 The annual review of each faculty member shall provide the primary basis for the chairperson's
5 recommendations relating to salary, promotion, granting of tenure, successive appointment, non-
6 reappointment, post-tenure review, and dismissal. Furthermore, this review is to provide
7 guidance and assistance to all faculty in their professional development and academic
8 responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

9 **A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation**

10 Detailed criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty shall be recommended by the
11 faculty and chairperson of each academic unit; these criteria and related procedures must be
12 submitted to the dean or director, the Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor for
13 approval. All procedures for annual reviews adopted by each unit shall include provision for, and
14 details for implementation of, the following:

- 15 1. No later than 30 days after the beginning of the first appointment of each faculty member,
16 the chairperson shall advise him or her in writing of the criteria, procedures, and instruments
17 currently used to assess performance;
- 18 2. No later than September 1 of each year, each faculty member shall be informed in writing
19 by the chairperson of the review schedule, criteria, procedures, and instruments to be used
20 that year;
- 21 3. No later than the second week of classes in the spring semester of each year, each faculty
22 member shall submit to the chairperson any materials desired to be considered in the annual
23 review;
- 24 4. Peer evaluation; Each academic unit shall establish procedures to provide its faculty the
25 opportunity to participate in the annual review of their peers. Except as set forth in this
26 policy, no particular system of peer review is prescribed. Academic units are encouraged to
27 develop a peer review system that is consistent with the unit's faculty resources, the
28 particular expertise of the unit's faculty members, and practices within the discipline.
 - 29 a. Solely by way of illustration, a unit might choose to create a separate peer review
30 committee. Alternatively, a unit might allocate the peer review process to the unit's
31 promotion and tenure committee. A unit might also decide to have all full-time
32 faculty participate in the peer review process for members of that unit.

33

34 b. Faculty participating in the peer review process shall provide feedback to the
35 chairperson regarding the performance of those reviewed. This feedback may take the
36 form of a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarship and creative
37 activity, and service, or it may take some other form, such as feedback regarding
38 specific performance tasks. Examples of the latter include a review of a published
39 article or a review of a peer’s teaching based upon a classroom visit.

40 c. If an academic unit forms a peer review committee, the following principles govern:

- 41 i. Membership eligibility for annual review committees shall be defined by each
42 academic unit. The composition of these committees should represent the
43 diverse composition of the unit in gender, race, and academic interests when
44 possible.
45 ii. If a representative committee of faculty from within the unit cannot be
46 formed, then the department chair or equivalent shall form the committee with
47 eligible and representative faculty across the college following approved
48 procedures to develop a pool of eligible faculty from both within and outside
49 UA Little Rock.
50

51 5. Student evaluation of teaching;

52 6. Prior to the chairperson’s making a recommendation in any year, the following shall occur:

- 53 a. A meeting between the chairperson and faculty member to discuss all issues relating to
54 the review,
55 b. The providing to that faculty member a copy of the chairperson’s tentative
56 recommendation(s), and
57 c. Reasonable opportunity for the faculty member to submit a written response to be
58 forwarded to each subsequent level of review.
59 d. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in any category (teaching,
60 scholarly and creative activity, or service), the chairperson shall provide a written
61 recommendation for improvement and, when appropriate, a commitment of resources
62 to be part of the subsequent year’s annual evaluation.
63 e. The faculty member and chairperson shall acknowledge that this meeting has
64 transpired by signature.

65 7. As long as a faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years
66 thereafter, the following documents shall be maintained: annual review forms, summaries
67 of annual discussion between the chairperson and faculty member, recommendations, and
68 all other writings used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member;

69 8. The following documents shall be available to each faculty member: all writings used in or
70 resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member including any writings relating to
71 the peer evaluation.

72

Executive Committee Proposed Text:

9. Each unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service).
10. The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.
11. Overall Unsatisfactory Rating and Post-tenure Review
 - a. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories, then the matter is referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the previous three years' materials to assess overall performance.
 - b. If the departmental tenure committee determines the individual is overall unsatisfactory, then post-tenure review (section II) will be initiated. If the department tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's overall performance shall be deemed satisfactory
 - c. The unit's operating procedures should specify the scope of materials for review, the voting procedures, and the method of voting.

Committee on Tenure Proposed Text (red text indicates CoT added text to the Exec. Cmte text):

9. Each unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service). Notwithstanding any of the other provisions in this policy (403.3), performance of a faculty member may be found unsatisfactory in any category (teaching, research and creative activity, or service) only when the performance in that category demonstrates professional incompetence.[1]
10. The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.
11. Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category, Overall Unsatisfactory Rating and Post-tenure Review
 - a. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories in two consecutive years[2] or in 3 out of the 3 categories in one year, then the matter is referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the previous three years' materials to assess overall performance.
 - b. If the departmental tenure committee determines the individual is overall unsatisfactory[3], then post-tenure review (section II) will be initiated. If the departmental tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's overall performance shall be deemed satisfactory.
 - c. To determine that an individual is overall unsatisfactory, the departmental tenure committee must, at minimum, determine that the individual was unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories in two consecutive years or in 3 out of the 3 categories in one year.

Committee on Tenure Proposed Text (cont.):

- d. The chairperson's evaluation of unsatisfactory in a category may be appealed to the departmental tenure committee. If the departmental tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's performance in the category is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's performance in that category shall be deemed satisfactory.
 - e. For a departmental tenure committee to determine that an individual's performance in any category is unsatisfactory, a minimum of sixty percent of the committee must vote in favor of a finding of unsatisfactory performance in that category.
 - f. The unit's operating procedures should specify the scope of materials for review, the voting procedures, and the method of voting.
-

[1] In other words, the minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service) are the minimum criteria for performance that is not professionally incompetent.

[2] The categories in which the individual is unsatisfactory can be different in the two consecutive years.

[3] In the evaluation of an overall unsatisfactory, the department tenure committee is not constrained to uphold or reject the chair's evaluation in each category, but rather forms an independent assessment of the individual's performance.