

# Progress on the Faculty Handbook - Chronology

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Dates</u>
Organizational meeting.....	8-19-14
Fsen. Comm. <b>received chapt. 1</b> (Introduction).....	9-22-14
Handbook Comm. – administration meeting.....	10-24 & 11-19-14
Fsen. Comm. <b>received chapt. 2</b> (Academic Governance).....	9-22-14
Handbook Comm. – administration meeting.....	10-24 & 11-19-14
Fsen. Handbook Comm. <b>received chapt. 3</b> (Rights & Responsibilities of Faculty).....	10-22-14
Handbook Comm. – administration meeting.....	11-19-14
Fsen Comm. <b>received chapt. 4</b> (Faculty Ranks & Classifications of Appointments).....	12-15-14
Handbook Comm. – administration meeting.....	12-16-14 & 1-28-15
SACS Occupied February	
<b>Requested chapt. 5</b> (Selection, Appointment, Tenure, & Career Development Of Tenure Track Faculty Members).....	1-28-15
Meeting requesting discontinuation of chapter-by-chapter review.....	3-20-15
FSEC meeting and response requesting continuation.....	3-27-15

## Procedure for the Annual Performance and Planning Review

### General Information

The assignment of faculty workloads is the delegated responsibility of the Department Chair. The Chair is responsible for the equitable assignment of faculty responsibilities and assures an appropriate balance of time and effort committed to teaching, research, public service, and if applicable, patient care. It is expected that faculty will devote full-time to their academic duties, unless released time is officially approved.

Each spring, the Chair and individual faculty member agree upon the faculty member's goals and the Chair's expectations during the upcoming year. This process and these expectations are documented as part of the annual faculty evaluation [i.e., Annual Performance and Planning Review]. Specific teaching assignments are usually made on a semester basis by the Department Chair.

Educational activities in a health science center necessarily involve patient care, sophisticated research, and teaching of rapidly changing and complex biomedical sciences. As is customary in most health science centers, faculty at UTHSC are assigned to specific duties consonant with their individual expertise in teaching, research, or patient care. Faculty are expected to engage in research (or equivalent scholarly activities), patient care, or both as necessary elements of health science education.

### Definitions and Applications of Faculty Performance Ratings

On June 19, 2003, the Board of Trustees approved a four-category scale for faculty performance ratings. Please read carefully the following definitions, as these will be applied for this year's Annual Performance and Planning Review.

**EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period the individual achieved and consistently exhibited unique and highly meritorious levels of professional performance beyond the agreed upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who achieves uncommon levels of meritorious performance in his or her field; and makes meaningful and significant contributions to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college, and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**MEETS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the faculty member achieved and consistently exhibited the level of the expected performance on the agreed-upon goals and objectives and who has contributed to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that did not consistently meet all the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who may require some assistance or feedback in achieving and sustaining a level of professional performance necessary to meet the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating is intended primarily as a means of formally communicating that a special effort must be made in addressing specific

# 2003 Annual Performance

## Procedure for the Annual Performance and Planning Review

The assignment of faculty workloads and work sites is the delegated responsibility of the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean when appropriate (Faculty Handbook, Sections 4.16.3 and 5.3.2). The Chair is responsible for the equitable assignment of faculty responsibilities and assures an appropriate balance of time and effort committed within the department to teaching, research, service, and if applicable, patient care. It is expected that faculty will devote full-time to their academic duties, unless released time is officially approved.

Each spring, the Chair and individual faculty member agree upon the faculty member's goals and the Chair's expectations during the upcoming year. This process and these expectations are documented as part of the annual faculty evaluation [i.e., Annual Performance and Planning Review]. Specific teaching assignments are usually made on a semester basis by the Department Chair.

Educational activities in a health science center necessarily involve patient care, sophisticated research, and teaching of rapidly changing and complex biomedical sciences. As is customary in most health science centers, faculty at UTHSC are assigned to specific duties consonant with their individual expertise in teaching, research, or patient care. Faculty are expected to engage in research (or equivalent scholarly activities), patient care, or both as necessary elements of health science education.

## Definitions and Applications of Faculty Performance Ratings

On June 19, 2003, the Board of Trustees approved a four-category scale for faculty performance ratings. Please read carefully the following definitions, as these will be applied for the Annual Performance and Planning Review.

**EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period the individual achieved and consistently exhibited unique and highly meritorious levels of professional performance beyond the agreed upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who achieves uncommon levels of meritorious performance in his or her field; and makes meaningful and significant contributions to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college, and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**MEETS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the faculty member achieved and consistently exhibited the level of the expected performance on the agreed-upon goals and objectives and who has contributed to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that did not consistently meet all the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who may

# 2003 Annual Performance

## The University of Tennessee Health Science Center

### PERFORMANCE RATING DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

**EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period the individual achieved and consistently exhibited unique and highly meritorious levels of professional performance beyond the agreed upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who achieves uncommon levels of meritorious performance in his or her field; and makes meaningful and significant contributions to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college, and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**MEETS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the faculty member achieved and consistently exhibited the level of the expected performance on the agreed-upon goals and objectives and who has contributed to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that did not consistently meet all the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who may require some assistance or feedback in achieving and sustaining a level of professional performance necessary to meet the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating is intended primarily as a means of formally communicating that a special effort must be made in addressing specific performance deficiencies. When this rating is given, it should be accompanied by a commitment by the Department Chair to assist the individual in identifying the mechanisms for overcoming the detected deficiencies, as deemed appropriate. **This rating is a negative rating. The Chair and the faculty member must develop a written plan with a specific time frame, whereby the faculty member can meet the departmental expectations within the next year; this plan must be contained in the summary of the Annual Performance and Planning Review.** A faculty member whose performance is rated as "needs improvement" shall be ineligible for rewards (including salary increases), and must provide to the Chair a written Interim Progress Report of remedial steps taken on his or her performance in area(s) noted as "unsatisfactory", with copies forwarded to the Dean.

**UNSATISFACTORY FOR RANK:** Unsatisfactory Performance in Teaching, Research, or Service is defined as adequate cause for termination of a faculty member's appointment and includes the following:

- a. Failure to demonstrate professional competence in teaching, research, or service; or
- b. Failure to perform satisfactorily the duties or responsibilities of the faculty position, including but not limited to (1) failure to comply with a lawful directive of the Chair, Dean, or UTHSC Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs with respect to the faculty member's duties or responsibilities; or (2) inability to perform an essential function of the faculty position, given reasonable accommodation, if requested.

**This rating is a negative rating. The Chair and the faculty member must develop a written plan with a specific time frame, whereby the faculty member can meet the departmental expectations within the next year; this plan must be contained in the summary of the Annual Performance and Planning Review.** A faculty member whose performance is rated as "unsatisfactory" shall be ineligible for rewards (including salary increases), and must provide to the Chair a written Interim Progress Report of remedial steps taken on his or her performance in area(s) noted as "unsatisfactory", with copies forwarded to the Dean. Alternatively, for a non-tenured faculty member an unsatisfactory rating may lead to termination for adequate cause, and for a tenure-track faculty member, an unsatisfactory rating on the Mandatory Interim Review may lead to a notice of non-renewal.

The Board's policy on tenure states that a comprehensive, formal, cumulative performance review (CPR) is triggered for (a) any tenured faculty member whose annual review is unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years; or (b) any tenured faculty member whose annual review is any combination of Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement in any three of five consecutive years. Within 30 days of being

# 2011 Faculty Senate Vote

**Subject:** Re: this am

**Date:** Thursday, April 7, 2011 11:31:06 AM Central Daylight Time

**From:** Smith, Richard A

**To:** Morreim, E Haavi (E Haavi)

Haavi,

I just got back to my office. We voted to return the wordage:

Faculty Evaluation Manual updates:

Proposed amendment to Faculty Evaluation Manual

Revise section 2.2.1c. Needs Improvement for Rank

Recommendation to change the first sentence of that section from:

This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that did not satisfy the goals, objectives, and/or work assignments.

TO:

This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that did not consistently meet the agreed-upon goals and objectives.

This Change passed unanimously.

Recommendation to change Appendix 1, form 1, under #6 from:

I understand that I have the right to disagree with this evaluation and to respond in writing in accordance with Section 2.3.3 of the Faculty Evaluation Manual.

TO:

I understand that I have the right to disagree with this evaluation and to respond in writing within five days from the date I received this form in accordance with Section 2.3.3 of the Faculty Evaluation Manual.

This Change passed unanimously.

Recommendation to change Section 2.3.3 from:

The faculty member may prepare an optional response to the Chair's review and expectations. This response, if any, should be attached to the summary document. A period of five days is suggested as a guideline for this response, if applicable.

TO:

The faculty member may prepare an optional response to the Chair's review and expectations. This response, if any, should be attached to the summary document. A period of ten business days is suggested as a guideline for this response, if applicable.

This Change passed unanimously.

There was also discussion concerning the timeline for faculty evaluations and the problem of the "gap period" from mid-May to July 1st. The issue will be brought up again at the monthly faculty meeting.

Did we miss anything?

Richard



## Procedure for the Annual Performance and Planning Review

### General Information

The assignment of faculty workloads is the delegated responsibility of the Department Chair. The Chair is responsible for the equitable assignment of faculty responsibilities and assures an appropriate balance of time and effort committed to teaching, research, public service, and if applicable, patient care. It is expected that faculty will devote full-time to their academic duties, unless released time is officially approved.

Each spring, the Chair and individual faculty member agree upon the faculty member's goals and the Chair's expectations during the upcoming year. This process and these expectations are documented as part of the annual faculty evaluation [i.e., Annual Performance and Planning Review]. Specific teaching assignments are usually made on a semester basis by the Department Chair.

Educational activities in a health science center necessarily involve patient care, sophisticated research, and teaching of rapidly changing and complex biomedical sciences. As is customary in most health science centers, faculty at UTHSC are assigned to specific duties consonant with their individual expertise in teaching, research, or patient care. Faculty are expected to engage in research (or equivalent scholarly activities), patient care, or both as necessary elements of health science education.

### Definitions and Applications of Faculty Performance Ratings

On June 19, 2003, the Board of Trustees approved a four-category scale for faculty performance ratings. Please read carefully the following definitions, as these will be applied for this year's Annual Performance and Planning Review.

**EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period the individual achieved and consistently exhibited unique and highly meritorious levels of professional performance beyond the agreed upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who achieves uncommon levels of meritorious performance in his or her field; and makes meaningful and significant contributions to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college, and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**MEETS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the faculty member achieved and consistently exhibited the level of the expected performance on the agreed-upon goals and objectives and who has contributed to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college and university, as well as to his or her professional field.

**NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that did not consistently meet all the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual who may require some assistance or feedback in achieving and sustaining a level of professional performance necessary to meet the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating is intended primarily as a means of formally communicating that a special effort must be made in addressing specific

## RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE RATINGS

**EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period the individual achieved and consistently exhibited uncommon and highly meritorious levels of performance beyond the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to a faculty member who makes meaningful and significant contributions to the mission, goals and objectives of the department, college, and campus, as well as to his or her professional field. Individuals provided with this rating are eligible for significant merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college and department fiscal situations.

**MEETS EXPECTATIONS FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period the individual achieved and consistently exhibited a level of performance that met the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating will be assigned to an individual whose competent performance exemplifies the standard of professionalism and proficiency within a given field. Individuals provided with this rating are eligible for minimum merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment that is consistent with campus, college, and department fiscal situations.

**NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that did not satisfy the goals, objectives, and/or work assignments. This rating will be assigned to an individual who may require some assistance or feedback in achieving and sustaining a level of professional performance necessary to meet the agreed-upon goals and objectives. This rating is intended primarily as a means of formally communicating that a special effort must be made in addressing specific performance deficiencies. This rating is a negative rating. A faculty member whose performance is rated as "needs improvement" shall be ineligible for merit pay or performance-based salary adjustment.

**UNSATISFACTORY FOR RANK:** This rating designates that during the evaluation period, the individual exhibited a level of performance that:

- a. failed to demonstrate professional competence in teaching, research, clinical care or service; or
- b. failed to perform satisfactorily the duties or responsibilities of the faculty position, including but not limited to (1) failure to comply with a lawful directive of the Chair, Dean, or UTHSC Chief Academic Officer with respect to the faculty member's duties or responsibilities; or (2) inability to perform an essential function of the faculty position, given reasonable accommodation, if requested.

This rating is a negative rating and is considered adequate cause for termination. A faculty member whose performance is rated as "unsatisfactory" shall be ineligible for any salary adjustment.

Within 30 days of the annual review, any faculty member rated "Needs Improvement for Rank" or "Unsatisfactory for Rank" must collaborate with the Chair to develop an Annual Review Improvement Plan that will be forwarded 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.

The Board's policy on tenure states that a comprehensive, formal, cumulative performance review (CPR) is triggered for (a) any tenured faculty member whose annual review is unsatisfactory in any two of five consecutive years; or (b) any tenured faculty member whose annual review is any combination of Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement in any three of five consecutive years. Within 30 days of being triggered, a CPR Committee shall be convened by the Dean, who shall determine its Chair. The Committee shall be composed of appropriate tenured departmental faculty (exclusive of the Chair), and appropriate faculty from outside the department. The faculty member being reviewed and the Department Chair may each name a campus tenured faculty to the Committee. The Committee normally should have at least five (5) members including the CPR Committee Chair and at least two (2) additional faculty nominated by the Faculty Senate. All committee members must be of same or higher faculty rank.