PROPOSED REVISION TO BOARD POLICY TO PERMIT BOARD-APPROVED CAMPUS-SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE RATING SCALES

Board Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure

Tenure § G – 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. The planning aspects of these annual academic year reviews should also 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, summarizing the review, 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 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.

The **Performance ratings scale** for annual reviews shall be **as follows approved by the Board of Trustees, and may include (in whole or part) the ratings defined below. Unless or until the Board of Trustees approves a campus-specific rating scale, campuses shall employ the rating scale defined below. To ensure seamless application of other faculty policies and procedures related to performance ratings (whether part of this document or some other policy or procedure), any campus-specific rating scale must explain how it articulates with the rating scale defined below.**

_and campus, college, and department bylaws must clarify the means and metric for each department head to employ in conducting these reviews. **Campus faculty handbooks, college bylaws, and department bylaws must clarify the means and metric for each department head to employ in the substantive performance criteria to be used when conducting these performance reviews within the particular unit.**
The following performance rating scale is to be applied in evaluating tenured faculty members when no campus-specific scale is in place:

a. Exceeds Expectations for Rank – eligible for significant merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and departmental fiscal situations;

b. Meets Expectations for Rank – eligible for minimum merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and departmental fiscal situations;

c. 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

d. Unsatisfactory for Rank – not eligible for any salary adjustment and required to implement an Annual Review Improvement Plan (see below).

Annual Review Improvement Plans: 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.

Appeal process: 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.