

**UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK**

**TRANSMITTAL OF FACULTY SENATE LEGISLATION**

Faculty Senate legislation is to be submitted to the chancellor to approve or disapprove within ten calendar days after the Assembly review period. The chancellor may approve or disapprove any Faculty Senate legislation within a period from the eleventh through the twenty-fifth calendar day after the Faculty Senate action has been presented to the Assembly, unless the Assembly has been petitioned to amend or rescind the Faculty Senate legislation. In the latter case, the chancellor's approval or disapproval shall be made no later than fifteen calendar days after the Assembly has voted on and failed to approve a motion to amend or rescind a legislative action of the Faculty Senate. The chancellor shall provide written reasons for disapproval to the Faculty Senate.

**To the Chancellor of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock:**

The following legislation passed the UALR Faculty Senate on January 28, 2022

**FS\_2022\_04 Annual Review – Section I**

**Be it resolved** to modify Annual Review policy (403.3) as indicated below (underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion), and

**Be it further resolved** that the implementation date for these changes to policy will begin in Spring 2023.

Policy 403.3 Annual Review

Section I. Annual Faculty Review

Pursuant to ACA 6-63-104, an annual review of the performance of all full time faculty members shall be made on the basis of assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures required herein.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to review the performance of adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, and lecturers according to requirements and guidelines established by the voting faculty as provided in the department's approved governance document.

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

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

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

1. No later than 30 days after the beginning of the first appointment of each faculty member, the chairperson shall advise him or her in writing of the criteria, procedures, and instruments currently used to assess performance;
2. No later than September 1 of each year, each faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the review schedule, criteria, procedures, and instruments to be used that year;
3. No later than the end of the<sup>1</sup> second week of classes in the spring semester of each year, each faculty member shall submit to the chairperson any materials desired to be considered in the annual review;
4. Each academic unit shall establish procedures to provide its faculty the opportunity to participate in the annual review of their peers. Except as set forth in this policy, no particular system<sup>2</sup> of peer review is prescribed. Academic units are encouraged to develop a peer review system that is consistent with the unit's faculty resources, the particular expertise of the unit's faculty members, and practices within the discipline.
  - a. Feedback from the peer review process will be provided to the chairperson regarding the performance of those reviewed<sup>3</sup>.
  - b. If an academic unit forms a peer review committee, the following principles govern:
    - i. Membership eligibility for peer review committees shall be defined by each academic unit. As much as possible, the composition of these committees should represent the diversity of faculty within the unit.
    - ii. The unit's approved governance document shall include procedures for developing a pool of eligible faculty if a committee from within the unit cannot be formed.

---

<sup>1</sup> This was added in FS\_2018\_20.

<sup>2</sup> Solely by way of illustration, a unit might choose to create a separate peer review committee. Alternatively, a unit might allocate the peer review process to the unit's promotion and tenure committee. A unit might also decide to have all full-time faculty participate in the peer review process for members of that unit.

<sup>3</sup> This feedback may take the form of a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service, or it may take some other form, such as feedback regarding specific performance tasks. Examples of the latter include a review of a published article or a review of a peer's teaching based upon a classroom visit.



5. Each academic unit shall establish procedures for student evaluation of teaching. The purpose of student evaluation of teaching is to provide students with a voice in curriculum development and implementation.
  - a. Student evaluations of teaching may not be the sole basis for evaluation of teaching.
  - b. The items included in the instrument administered to students to evaluate teaching must be approved by the department, college, or university faculty.
  - c. The data resulting from a faculty member's student evaluation of teaching must be made available to that faculty member in a timely manner and are confidential. These data may only be made available to those involved in performance evaluation (faculty member, chairperson, peer evaluation committee, promotion and tenure committee).
  
6. Prior to the chairperson's making a recommendation in any year, the following shall occur:
  - a. A meeting between the chairperson and faculty member to discuss all issues relating to the review,
  - b. The providing to that faculty member a copy of the chairperson's tentative recommendation(s), and
  - c. ~~Reasonable opportunity for the faculty member to~~ may submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review within thirty (30) days of the meeting in 6.b.
  - d. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in any category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, or service), the chairperson shall provide a written recommendation for improvement and, when appropriate, a commitment of resources to be part of the subsequent year's annual evaluation.
  - e. The faculty member and chairperson shall acknowledge that this meeting has transpired by signature.
  - f. If the faculty member believes that an evaluation or recommendation resulting from annual review violates their rights under established university policy, they may submit a written appeal to the dean. This written appeal may request consideration of the evaluation by the dean, based on specific, articulated concerns. The dean shall make the determination on the annual review. This determination should be informed by the department's approved criteria.
  - ~~g. If a faculty member objects within 30 days of receiving the chairperson's final evaluation of unsatisfactory in a single category, then the chairperson's evaluation shall be sent to departmental tenure committee. The departmental tenure committee shall make an evaluation independent of the chairperson for that category.~~
  - ~~h. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of 3 categories, then the matter is referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the previous three years' materials to assess overall performance as specified in 11.~~

- ~~i.—The evaluations of both the chairperson and the tenure committee shall be sent to the next level if the chair finds the faculty member unsatisfactory in one or more categories.~~
7. As long as a faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter, the following documents shall be maintained: annual review forms, summaries of annual discussion between the chairperson and faculty member, recommendations, and all other writings used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member;
  8. The following documents shall be available to each faculty member: all writings used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member including any writings relating to the peer evaluation.
  9. Each academic unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service). If an academic unit does not have approved criteria, the criteria defined in the generic department governance document shall be used.
  10. The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The chairperson shall consider the annual review committee's evaluation when assessing annual performance.
  - 11.<sup>4</sup>

#### B. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Each faculty member shall render service to the University by the standards of the University<sup>5</sup> Faculty Handbook and shall behave in a professional and ethical manner. Each faculty member shall be evaluated based on his or her achievements with respect to assigned duties and the areas of teaching (or professional performance for faculty members with non-teaching appointments), scholarly or creative activity, and academically-related service.

~~Competency in teaching (or professional performance) is a minimum criterion for satisfactory annual review. However, each unit (department) may allow flexibility in identifying the relative importance of each area. In addition, off-campus duty assignments, and research, and administrative assignments shall be taken into account when establishing individual criteria for a specific review period.~~

The programmatic learning outcomes data collected from an individual faculty member shall not be used in annual reviews for that person.


---

<sup>4</sup> See motion FS\_2022\_1 for changes to section I.A.11.

<sup>5</sup> This was changed in FS\_2018\_20.

Evidence, qualifying activities, and artifacts to be used in evaluating teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service are defined in the Promotion and Tenure policy (403.15).

Disseminated to University Assembly January 31, 2022

Faculty Senate President's Signature  Date January 31, 2022  
Amanda Nolen

Received in chancellor's office on FEB 14 2022 (date)

Chancellor's Action:

APPROVED Chancellor's Signature  Date 2/14/2022  
Christina Drale

DISAPPROVED Chancellor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(reasons to be attached) Christina Drale