

## Policy AA-FPT-PO5

### Annual Review and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

---

#### Contents

- I. Section 6-726 Preamble
  - II. Section 6-727 Annual Review of Tenured Faculty
  - III. Section 6-728 Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
  - IV. Section 6-729 Implementation
  - V. Section 6-730 Notification
  - VI. Section 6-731 Oversight
  - VII. Section 6-732 Intent
- 

#### I. **Section 6-726 Preamble**

The University of Texas at Arlington recognizes the time-honored practice of tenure for university faculty as an important protection of free inquiry, open intellectual and scientific debate, unfettered criticism of the accepted body of knowledge, and shared faculty governance of the institution. Academic institutions have a special need for practices that protect freedom of expression, because the core of the academic enterprise involves a continual reexamination of ideas. Academic disciplines thrive and grow through critical analysis of conventions and theories. The best way to guarantee the integrity of an academic institution is to ensure that members of the faculty are free to contribute openly to the governance of that institution.

Tenure is essential, not merely for protection of individual faculty members, but also as an assurance to society that the pursuit of truth and knowledge commands our first priority. Without freedom to question, there can be no freedom to learn. The process of reviewing faculty performance should at all times enhance, encourage and protect these principles.

In accordance with Regents' *Rule* 31102, the University must conduct annual reviews of all tenured faculty, as well as comprehensive periodic evaluations of all tenured faculty (no less often than every six years). Annual reviews and comprehensive periodic evaluations of tenured faculty should focus primarily on individual merit relative to the performance of assigned duties. The purpose of the annual review and comprehensive period evaluation is twofold:

- A. to assess each tenured faculty member's performance in the context of expectations established by the university (at the departmental, program, college, and/or institutional levels), and
- B. to support tenure and promote faculty development by providing the faculty member with guidance.

If any recommendations are made regarding the faculty member's continued employment at the University (including merit increases), then such recommendations should be consistent with the faculty member's annual review.

## II. **Section 6-727 Annual Review of Tenured Faculty**

### A. **Review Mandate**

As required by Regents' *Rule* 31102, section 5.1 (b), each department (or equivalent unit) shall conduct an annual review of its tenured faculty.

1. The evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period will coincide with approved leave, comprehensive review for promotion, or appointment to an endowed position.
2. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.

### B. **Review Criteria**

Written criteria for annual review of tenured faculty shall be established by the faculty in each department (or equivalent unit), subject to the approval of the dean, provost and president, and be made available to each faculty member. The evaluation criteria:

1. shall establish appropriate standards for assessing the annual performance by each tenured faculty member of the department (or equivalent unit).
2. shall be written such that each faculty member's annual performance in the areas of teaching, research (or creative activity), and service can be placed in one of the following four categories: "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "unsatisfactory."
3. shall establish standards for assessing each faculty member's overall annual performance by specifying what combination of evaluations for each area of professional responsibility will lead to an overall evaluation of "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "unsatisfactory."
4. shall be made available to each faculty member in the department (or equivalent).

### C. **Apportionment of Workload**

As a precursor to the annual review process, each tenured faculty member and his or her immediate supervisor shall apportion the faculty member's workload among the areas of professional responsibility subject to review.

1. With the exception of those tenured faculty members who bear administrative responsibilities (see section G below), a faculty member's total workload of 100% shall be apportioned among teaching, research

(or creative activity) and service, with the percentage assigned to each area being at least 10%.

2. The apportionment of workload for a given academic year must be determined by the first Monday of March of the same academic year and shall be employed as part of that year's review (which will occur during the fall semester of the immediately following academic year).

#### D. **Review Materials**

By the first Monday of November, each tenured faculty member must submit to his or her department chair (or equivalent immediate supervisor) an "annual review dossier" in the form of an electronic file.

1. The annual review dossier shall include:
  - a. the faculty member's current and complete curriculum vitae;
  - b. a report of professional accomplishments for the immediately preceding academic year, including evidence of all professional activity, for example, teaching, advising, student research supervision, research, publication, creative activities, service and/or any other relevant activity;
  - c. summary reports for all Student Feedback Surveys for organized courses taught during the immediately preceding academic year; and
  - d. copies of any peer evaluations of teaching (if available).

In addition, the faculty member may provide a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials deemed appropriate.

2. The faculty member retains the right to review and copy all materials in his or her file at any time during the evaluation process that such materials are not in actual use.

#### E. **Review Procedure**

While each academic unit may establish its own guidelines for the annual review process, all reviews must conform to the following common standards as established by Regents' *Rule* 31102.

1. Initial assessment of each faculty member's performance as presented in the annual review dossier shall be carried out in accordance with the written policies established by the faculty member's department (or equivalent unit), as approved by the dean and provost. In all cases, the individual or committee undertaking the initial review shall:
  - a. categorize the faculty member's performance of professional duties for the period under review as "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or

"unsatisfactory" relative to the written criteria established by the department (or equivalent unit) in each area of professional responsibility;

- b. similarly categorize the faculty member's overall performance for the same period; and
  - c. (optionally) provide a written assessment of the faculty member's professional strengths and weaknesses.
2. The party responsible for recording the results of the initial assessment shall forward the document for review at the next level(s), as specified in the academic unit's written guidelines. At each subsequent level, the individual responsible for review shall indicate his or her concurrence (or lack thereof) with the evaluation and (optionally) provide written comments.
  3. When the faculty member's immediate supervisor has completed his or her evaluation responsibilities (however specified in the academic unit's written guidelines), the immediate supervisor will present the faculty member with a written copy of the annual review report. The faculty member will countersign to indicate that he or she has received and read the report. Should the faculty member object to the review (in part or in whole), he or she may express such objection(s) in writing to his or her immediate supervisor within five working days. Written objections shall be appended to the report.
  4. Upon receipt of each faculty member's annual review report and dossier, the dean of each school or college shall indicate either concurrence with the initial evaluation or offer an alternative assessment.
  5. By the first Monday of March, a summary report of all annual reviews for tenured faculty in each college and school shall be forwarded by the deans to the provost for final review. The provost reserves the right to request annual review documents and dossiers for any individual faculty member for further investigation.
  6. Final results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing by the provost to the appropriate dean, who will then forward the results to the faculty member's immediate supervisor. The faculty member's immediate supervisor will communicate the results to the faculty member.

**F. Special Provisions for Faculty with Joint Appointments or Administrative Responsibilities**

For those tenured faculty members who hold joint appointments or who bear administrative responsibilities, the following additional provisions apply.

1. Tenured Faculty Members who hold Joint Appointments

- a. Tenured faculty members with joint appointments in two or more academic units and where the time is not equally shared shall follow the procedures for the academic unit in which he or she spends the most time. The nature of the joint appointment shall be determined by reference to the appointment letter governing the academic year under review.
  - b. Tenured faculty members with appointments in two or more academic units and where the time is equally shared among those units shall elect the academic unit in which they will begin their annual review. When evaluating the faculty member, the individual or committee charged with writing the initial review shall consider all the materials submitted by the faculty member and shall consult the academic administrator(s) for the units in which the faculty member also holds an appointment.
2. Tenured Faculty Members who bear Administrative Responsibilities.
- a. For those tenured faculty members who bear administrative responsibilities in the context of either a nine-month academic appointment or a split academic/administrative appointment (e.g., department chairs, program directors, associate deans):
    - i. Total workload (100%) shall be apportioned to four areas of professional responsibility: teaching, research (or creative activity), service, and administration.
    - ii. The apportionment to each of the four areas shall be at least 10%. Temporary exceptions to this minimum apportionment must be approved by the faculty member's dean and the provost.
    - iii. The review process shall proceed according to the procedures set forth in the immediately preceding paragraphs (B through E) of the current section.
  - b. For those tenured faculty members who bear administrative responsibilities in the context of a twelve-month administrative appointment:
    - i. Total workload (100%) shall be apportioned to one area of professional responsibility: administration.
    - ii. Responsibility for the annual review process shall be assumed by the faculty member's immediate supervisor and proceed according to the procedures governing the annual review of academic administrators (*Handbook of Operating Procedures*, [Section 2-252](#)).

**G. Uses of the Review Results**

1. The results of the annual review shall play a significant role in determining merit for merit raises.

2. The results of the annual review shall inform decisions regarding the apportionment of workload for the next academic year.
3. One or more evaluations of "exceeds expectations" may provide a basis for recommending special honors or for initiating consideration for more rapid or extraordinary promotion following the processes provided for in the university policy on promotion and tenure. However, the annual review process cannot take the place of the much more complete and comprehensive peer review process that such honors or promotions normally require.
4. An evaluation of "does not meet expectations" may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues or service expectations.
  - a. Responses to an evaluation of "does not meet expectations" may include adjustments of assigned duties. Such arrangements should be arrived at by agreement with the faculty member; however, if agreement cannot be reached, the chair or dean has authority to make such adjustments.
  - b. All such agreements or adjustments shall be made in writing and appended to the faculty member's annual review report.
  - c. The faculty member's progress in response to any such agreements or adjustments in assigned duties shall be monitored through the annual evaluations process.
5. An evaluation of "unsatisfactory" may be used to develop recommendations for providing support for faculty improvement, as described in the immediately preceding section. An evaluation of "unsatisfactory" may also lead to additional administrative action or monitoring beyond the annual evaluation process.
  - a. Any decision to take administrative action or monitoring beyond the annual evaluation process shall be made in writing by the provost, in consultation with the faculty member (when possible) and the dean.
  - b. All such decisions shall be conveyed to the faculty member in writing by the provost and appended to the faculty member's annual report.
  - c. A faculty member may appeal such a decision by notifying the dean and the provost in writing within five working days after the decision has been issued by the Office of the Provost.
6. A tenured faculty member whose evaluation is "unsatisfactory" for two consecutive years may be subject to:

- a. a comprehensive periodic evaluation (also known as "sixth-year post-tenure review"), as provided for in the institution's policy on comprehensive periodic evaluations or
- b. action under Sec. 5.1(g)(3) or 5.3 or Regents' *Rule* 31102.

The decision to undertake a comprehensive periodic performance evaluation outside of the normal time-frame of six years shall be made by the provost in consultation with the president, the vice president for human resources, and the dean of the college or school.

#### H. Grievances

The annual review process is subject to the University's grievance policy as appropriate.

### III. Section 6-728 Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

#### A. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Mandate

As required by the *Texas Education Code* Section 51.942 and Regents' *Rule* 31102, each department (or equivalent unit) shall conduct a comprehensive periodic evaluation of its tenured faculty.

1. Comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall be performed no less often than every six years. For the purpose of calculating the six year period, a "year" shall be the state fiscal year. Periods during which a faculty member is on leave of absence may not be counted toward the six years.
2. The faculty member subject to a comprehensive periodic evaluation shall be given at least six months prior notification of the intended evaluation by the provost, who shall also notify the dean and the department chair (or equivalent).
3. The evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period will coincide with approved leave, comprehensive review for promotion, or appointment to an endowed position.
4. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.

#### B. Evaluation Criteria

The faculty in each department (or equivalent unit) shall establish written evaluation criteria for the comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty; these criteria must be consistent with applicable provisions of UT System Regents' *Rules* and are subject to the approval of the dean, provost and president. The evaluation criteria:

1. shall establish appropriate standards for evaluating the performance of each tenured faculty member in the department (or equivalent unit).

2. shall be written such that each faculty member's comprehensive performance in the areas of teaching, research (or creative activity), and service can be placed in one of the following four categories: "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "unsatisfactory."
3. shall establish standards for assessing each faculty member's overall comprehensive performance by specifying what combination of evaluations for each area of professional responsibility will lead to an overall evaluation of "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "unsatisfactory."
4. shall be made available to each faculty member in the department (or equivalent).

**C. No Apportionment of Workload for Periodic Evaluation**

Given multi-year scope of the comprehensive periodic evaluation, no apportionment of workload is to be incorporated into the evaluation process. The results of the comprehensive periodic review shall, however, inform the faculty member's workload apportionment for the immediately following academic year.

**D. Evaluation Materials**

By the first Monday of November, each tenured faculty member scheduled to undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation must submit to his or her department chair (or equivalent immediate supervisor) a "comprehensive periodic evaluation dossier" in the form of an electronic file.

1. The comprehensive periodic evaluation dossier shall include:
  - a. the faculty member's current and complete curriculum vitae;
  - b. a report of professional accomplishments for the period under review, including evidence of all professional activity, for example, teaching, advising, student research supervision, research, publication, creative activities, service and/or any other relevant activity;
  - c. a summary report of all Student Feedback Surveys (or equivalent student evaluations of teaching) for all organized courses taught during the period under review;
  - d. copies of any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the period under review (if available);
  - e. copies of each annual review report for the years since his or her most recent comprehensive periodic review or, if no previous comprehensive periodic review has been conducted, appointment as a tenured member of the faculty; and



In addition, the faculty member may provide a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials deemed appropriate.

2. The faculty member retains the right to review and copy all materials in his or her file at any time during the evaluation process that such materials are not in actual use.

#### **E. Evaluation Procedure**

While each academic unit may establish its own guidelines for the comprehensive periodic evaluation process, all evaluations must conform to the following common standards as established by Regents' *Rule* 31102.

1. Unlike the annual review process, for which peer review is permitted but not required, the comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty must include peer review.
  - a. The members of peer review committees shall include representatives of the college/school or department and will be appointed, on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength, by the dean or chair in consultation with the tenured faculty in the college/school or department or pursuant to other process as defined in institutional policies.
  - b. The academic unit's procedural guidelines must specify both the composition of the peer review committee and the means by which the members of the committee are to be chosen (e.g., by election or by appointment).
  - c. The faculty member shall be provided with an opportunity to meet with the committee or committees.
2. Initial evaluation of each faculty member's performance as presented in the comprehensive post-tenure evaluation dossier shall be carried out in accordance with the written policies established by the faculty member's department (or equivalent unit), as approved by the dean and provost.
  - a. The academic unit's guidelines must specify which individual or committee shall be responsible for reviewing the materials in the faculty member's comprehensive periodic evaluation dossier (see above) and drafting the evaluation. Per Regents' *Rule* 31102, this review and evaluation of the dossier may be undertaken by the department (or equivalent unit), the department chair (or equivalent), a peer review committee (see above) or the dean.
  - b. In all cases, individual or committee undertaking the comprehensive periodic evaluation shall:
    - i. Categorize the faculty member's performance of professional duties for the period under review relative to

the written criteria established by the department (or equivalent unit).

- ii. Categorize the faculty member's overall performance for the same period.
  - iii. Provide a written assessment of the faculty member's professional strengths and weaknesses.
  - iv. Record all evaluations and any accompanying comments on a form provided for such purposes by the Office of the Provost.
  - v. Make provisions for the faculty member under review to read a draft of the comprehensive periodic evaluation and to offer responses and corrections to the draft in writing (either electronically or as hard copy text) to the individual responsible for completing the initial evaluation within a reasonable period of time.
3. The party responsible for recording the results of the initial evaluation shall forward the document for review at the next level(s), as specified in the academic unit's written guidelines. At each subsequent level, the individual responsible for review shall indicate his or her concurrence (or lack thereof) with the evaluation and (optionally) provide written comments.
  4. When the faculty member's immediate supervisor has completed his or her evaluation responsibilities (however specified in the academic unit's written guidelines), the immediate supervisor will present the faculty member with a written copy of the comprehensive periodic evaluation report. The faculty member will countersign to indicate that he or she has received and read the report. Should the faculty member object to the review (in part or in whole), he or she may express such objection(s) in writing to his or her immediate supervisor within five working days. Written objections shall be appended to the report.
  5. Upon receipt of each faculty member's comprehensive periodic evaluation report and dossier, the dean of each school or college shall indicate either concurrence with the initial evaluation or offer an alternative assessment.
  6. By the first Monday of March, comprehensive periodic evaluations of tenured faculty in each college and school shall be forwarded by the deans to the provost for final review.
  7. Final results of the comprehensive periodic evaluation will be communicated in writing by the provost to the faculty member, with copies sent to the department chair (or equivalent), the dean, and the president.

#### **F. Uses of the Evaluation Results**

1. The results of the comprehensive periodic evaluation shall play a significant role in determining merit for merit raises.
2. The results of the comprehensive periodic evaluation, functioning in lieu of the annual review, shall inform decisions regarding the apportionment of workload for the next academic year.
3. One or more evaluations of "exceeds expectations" may provide a basis for recommending special honors, awards, or other forms of performance recognition.
4. For individuals whose performance indicates they would benefit from additional institutional support or a remediation plan, the comprehensive periodic evaluation shall be used to provide such support or a remediation plan (e.g., teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues/service expectations). Schools/colleges and/or departments, in consultation with a peer committee, shall monitor individuals receiving such support for evidence of improvement and, if there is insufficient improvement, shall take action under (5) or (6) below.
5. Individuals whose performance is unsatisfactory may be subject to further review and/or to appropriate administrative action, such as adjustments of assigned duties.
  - a. Such arrangements should be arrived at by agreement with the faculty member; however, if agreement cannot be reached, the chair or dean has authority to make such adjustments.
  - b. All such agreements or adjustments shall be made in writing and appended to the faculty member's comprehensive periodic evaluation report.
  - c. If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action may be taken under Section (6) below.
6. **Termination or Other Appropriate Disciplinary Action.** If there is evidence that a tenured faculty member's unsatisfactory performance is due to incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause, then review to determine if good cause exists for termination under the current *Regents' Rules and Regulations* shall be considered, in accordance with the due process procedures of the *Regents' Rules and Regulations*, Rule 31008. If disciplinary action other than termination is considered appropriate, such faculty members shall have access to procedures that include notice of the specific charges and a hearing prior to the imposition of disciplinary action.
7. **Follow-up Review.** The acceptance and success of periodic evaluation for tenured faculty will be dependent upon a well-executed, critical process and an institutional commitment to assist and support faculty development. Thus, remediation and follow-up review for faculty, who would benefit from such support, as well as the designation of an

academic administrator with primary responsibility for monitoring such needed follow-up activities, are essential.

**G. Special Provisions for Faculty with Joint or Administrative Appointments**

For those members of the faculty who hold joint appointments or who hold administrative appointments, the following additional provisions apply.

1. Tenured Faculty Members who hold Joint Appointments
  - a. Faculty members with joint appointments in two or more academic units and where the time is not equally shared shall follow the procedures for the academic unit in which he or she has spent the most time during the period covered by the comprehensive periodic evaluation. The nature of the joint appointment shall be determined by reference to the appointment letters governing each of the academic years under review.
  - b. Faculty members with appointments in two or more academic units and where the time is equally shared among those units shall elect the academic unit in which they will begin their comprehensive periodic evaluation. When evaluating the faculty member, the individual or committee charged with writing the initial review shall consider all the materials submitted by the faculty member and shall consult the academic administrator(s) for the units in which the faculty member also holds an appointment.
2. Tenured Faculty Members who bear Administrative Responsibilities
  - a. For those tenured faculty members who bore administrative responsibilities at any time during the period under evaluation but, at the time of the comprehensive periodic evaluation, no longer bear administrative responsibilities, the comprehensive periodic evaluation shall:
    - i. address three areas of professional responsibility: teaching, research (or creative activity) and service; and
    - ii. proceed according to the procedures set forth in the previous paragraphs of the current section.
  - b. For those tenured faculty members who, at the time of the comprehensive period evaluation, bear administrative responsibilities in the context of either a nine-month academic appointment or a split academic/administrative appointment and have held comparable appointments for each of the three immediately preceding academic years, the comprehensive periodic review shall:

- i. address four areas of professional responsibility: teaching, research (or creative activity), service, and administration; and
    - ii. proceed according to the procedures set forth in the previous paragraphs of the current section.
  - c. For those tenured faculty members who, at the time of the comprehensive periodic review, bear administrative responsibilities in the context of a twelve-month administrative appointment and have held comparable appointments for each of the three immediately preceding academic years, the evaluation process described in the current section shall be subsumed under the process for periodically reviewing academic administrators (*Handbook of Operating Procedures*, [Section 2-253](#)).

#### H. **Grievances**

The comprehensive periodic evaluation process is subject to the University's grievance policy as appropriate.

#### IV. **Section 6-729 Implementation**

The Annual Review of Tenured Faculty and the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty described in the immediately preceding sections shall be instituted during the 2012-13 academic year. For the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, a faculty member will be evaluated on a six-year cycle determined by the academic year of his or her last comprehensive review.

#### V. **Section 6-730 Notification**

- A. The chief academic officer shall send a written notification to all tenure-track and tenured faculty members detailing the specifics of this policy once it is approved by the Board of Regents.
- B. The department chair (or equivalent) shall inform, via the letter of offer, all new tenure-track and tenure hires to the faculty of the specifics of this policy.

#### VI. **Section 6-731 Oversight**

- A. At the final Faculty Senate meeting of each academic year, the chief academic officer shall provide a report summarizing the number of faculty evaluated under this policy and the result of those evaluations.
- B. This policy will be reviewed every two years after initial implementation by UT Arlington's chief academic officer in consultation with the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee. A report summarizing the review will be presented to the Faculty Senate.

#### VII. **Section 6-732 Intent**

Nothing in this document or the application of institutional evaluation policies shall be interpreted or applied to infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process or other protected rights, nor to establish new term-tenure systems or to require faculty to reestablish their credentials for tenure.