



THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

FACULTY SENATE
Faculty Affairs Committee

Friday, October 1, 1999

MEMORANDUM

To: Mary Papke, President, Faculty Senate

From: Faculty Affairs Committee

Subject: Manual for Faculty Evaluation

The Faculty Affairs Committee believes that the Evaluation Manual should be approved by the Senate before it is implemented. If there is no commitment from the Administration to that effect, then we wish to put a resolution about the matter before the Senate at the meeting on October 18.

The following comments are recommendations for changes in particular parts of the draft of the Evaluation Manual.

Draft, p. 1, "Preface" (line 11)

To assess the quality of a faculty member's performance in teaching, research and service ...

Proposed

[maintain consistency throughout the document, where in other places research is referred to as "research, creative and/or scholarly achievements" (e.g., p. 2, "Procedures," line 3)]

Draft, p. 2, "Probationary Period" (line 2)

... a probationary faculty member must be considered no later than ...

Proposed

... a probationary faculty member must be considered *for tenure* no later than...

Draft, p. 2, "Procedures ..." (line 6)

The general results of the evaluation should be made known ...

Proposed

The general results of the evaluation *must* be made known ...

Draft, p. 4 (line -1)

Department head should give a copy ...

Proposed

Department head *must* give a copy ...

Draft, p. 5, “General Information” (line 5)

... and is awarded in a particular department.

Proposed

... and is awarded in a particular department *and any successor department in case of merger or alteration of departments.*

Draft, p. 5, “Review Procedures” (line 2)

... review by the college or the University Libraries; and review by the University.

Proposed

... review by the college ~~or the University Libraries~~; and review by the University. *For library faculty, there are two levels: peer review by the University Libraries and review by the University.*¹

Draft, p. 5, “Review Procedures” (line 5)

It is incumbent that at each level of review careful professional judgment of the accomplishments, productivity, and potential of each candidate be exercised.

Proposed

It is incumbent that *careful professional judgment of the accomplishments, productivity, and potential of each candidate be exercised at each level of review.*

Draft, p. 5, “Review Procedures” (line 6)

Initial peer review (e.g., at the department level) will focus ...

Proposed

Initial peer review (e.g., at the department level*) will focus ...

** The term “department,” as used in this document, also refers to the University Libraries.*
[footnote to be added]

Draft, p. 5, “Review Procedures” (line 7)

Reviews at the college or University Libraries level will bring ...

Proposed

Reviews at the college ~~or University Libraries~~ level will bring ...

¹Note that for the Libraries the unit itself is the lowest level of organization, equivalent to a “department.” Cf. the Trustees’ language in their June 1998 policy: “‘Department’ refers to the smallest academic unit (in some cases a ‘college,’ ‘school,’ or ‘division’)....”

At the same time, the committee is concerned that faculty in units without actual departments lose important protections. The function of review of the judgment of the department head by the dean is to provide oversight and the opportunity to correct errors. If the “department head” *is* the dean, then an entire level of oversight is eliminated. We strongly recommend that measures be implemented to guarantee to faculty in units without departments the same protections and due process available to faculty in units organized by departments.

Draft, p. 6 (line 6)

... to the department head ...

Proposed

...to the department head* ...

* *The term “department head,” as used in this document, also refers to the Dean of Libraries.*

[footnote to be added]

Draft, p. 6 (line 7)

If a department does not form a subcommittee to present the candidate’s case to the faculty, a representative of the review committee must be selected ...

Proposed

If a department does not form a subcommittee to present the candidate’s case to the faculty, *as might be the case in a small department*, a representative of the review committee must be selected ...

Draft, p. 6, “Role ... Department” (1st bullet)

- Teaching ability and effectiveness;

Proposed

- Teaching ability and effectiveness;*

* *In the case of the University Libraries and other units in which teaching is not the primary function, the first criterion is performance of duties outlined in the job description, rather than teaching ability and effectiveness.* [footnote to be added]

Draft, p. 7, “Role ... Department”

Academic administrators ... should develop a written statement... Such written statements should be prepared for: ...

Proposed

Academic administrators ... *must* develop a written statement... Such written statements *must* be prepared for: ...

Draft, p. 7, “Guidelines” (No. 2)

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be based on self assessment, peer evaluation, and student ratings.

Proposed

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be based on self assessment, peer evaluation, and *University-approved* student ratings. *Student ratings should not receive greater weight than self or peer assessments during faculty evaluation processes.*

Draft, p. 7, “Guidelines” (No. 3)

University-approved evaluations by students ... evaluating a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

Proposed

[delete entire item.]

<p>Draft, p. 8, “Organization” (No. 2.a)</p> <p>Evaluative statements written by the candidate</p> <p>RATIONALE: To prohibit evaluative statements is inconsistent with the requirement that candidates write self-assessments of teaching. Note, for example, that self-assessment may include “... a teaching portfolio that ... considers strengths and areas for improvement ...” (Draft, p. 38, line 14).</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>[delete entire item.]</p>
<p>Draft, p. 9, “Organization” (No. 2.d)</p> <p>Letters of appreciation or thanks</p> <p>RATIONALE: For some faculty, for example in the Libraries, such letters are a principal source of information about job performance.</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>[delete entire item.]</p>
<p>Draft, p. 9, “Role” (No. 2)</p> <p>... (not including external letters of assessment)</p> <p>...</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>... (not including external letters of assessment <i>except where review is permitted by the Tennessee Freedom of Information Law</i>) ...</p>
<p>Draft, p. 10, “External” (No. 4)</p> <p>The process of obtaining external letters of assessment should begin far enough in advance</p> <p>...</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>The process of obtaining external letters of assessment <i>must</i> begin far enough in advance ...</p>
<p>Draft, p. 11, “Statements” (line 6)</p> <p>Departmental faculty views should be summarized.... This letter ... should be made available to the faculty....</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>Departmental faculty views <i>must</i> be summarized.... This letter ... <i>must</i> be made available to the faculty....</p>
<p>Draft, p. 11, “Dissenting Reports” (line 2)</p> <p>Dissenting statements become part of the record</p> <p>...</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>Dissenting statements <i>must</i> become part of the <i>dossier</i> ...</p>
<p>Draft, p. 13, “Contents” (line 2)</p> <p>The dossier should be prepared ...</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>The dossier <i>must</i> be prepared ...</p>
<p>Draft, p. 14, “UTK Record” (line 4)</p> <p>... as of May 31, ____ (May prior to the review):</p>	<p>Proposed</p> <p>... as of the May 31st prior to this review:</p>

Draft, p. 14, “Recommendations” (line 12)

A copy of the report of the college committee should also be attached.

Proposed

A copy of the report of the college committee *must* also be attached.

Draft, p. 15, “Educational History” (line 1)

Dates in Attendance

RATIONALE: Part of the program may be done *in absentia*.

Proposed

Dates in *Program*

Draft, p. 16, “Statement” (line 2)

The following statement approved by The Board of Trustees should be used in assigning duties and responsibilities members of the UTK faculty.

The assigned workload for full-time faculty shall consist of a combination of teaching, advising, research, and/or creative activities; and institutional, and/or public service.

Proposed

The following statement ~~approved by The Board of Trustees~~ should be used in assigning duties and responsibilities *to* members of the UTK faculty.

The assigned workload for full-time faculty shall consist of ~~a combination~~ *performance of duties specified in the position description, which will normally be of* teaching, advising, research and/or creative activities, and ~~institutional, and/or~~ public service.

Draft, p. 16, “Statement” (line 14)

... and other appropriate considerations shall be used to determine teaching load.

Proposed

... and other appropriate considerations, *as identified in the next paragraph*, shall be used to determine teaching load.

Draft, p. 16, “Department” (line 7)

Deficiencies in some respects may be balanced by unusual excellence in others.

Proposed

Imbalances in some respects may be *offset* by unusual excellence in others.

Draft, p. 18, “Research” (2nd bullet)

1. Articles published in refereed journals
2. Books
3. Parts of books
4. Articles published in nonrefereed journals
5. Articles appearing in in-house organs
6. Research reports to sponsor

Proposed

1. Articles published in refereed *archival* journals
2. *Manuscripts (full length)*
3. *Contributions to edited volumes*
4. *Papers published in refereed conference proceedings*
5. *Papers or extended abstracts published in conference proceedings (refereed on the basis of abstract)*
6. *Articles in popular press*
7. *Articles published in in-house organs*
8. *Research reports to sponsor*
9. *Electronic scholarly and/or creative activity*

RATIONALE: Although the existing list of publication types is rather extensive, it does not reflect or distinguish the various types of publications encountered, particularly in many of the natural sciences and engineering. This list incorporates some items from the list in the memorandum from Dr. Woods dated 9/29/99.

Draft, p. 18, “Research” (3rd bullet)

... literature, music theatre, and visual art.

Proposed

... literature, *music, theatre*, and visual art.

Draft, p. 25, “Retention” (line 2)

The head will convey the outcome of this review to the candidate in writing and in a timely manner.

Proposed

The head will convey the outcome of this review to the candidate in writing *at the same time that the results of the review and a retention recommendation are sent to the College, following the retention schedule in Appendix E.*

Draft, p. 26, “Department” (line 6)

The department head will remind the faculty of their right to forward a dissenting report if they do not agree with the head’s findings.

Proposed

The department head will remind the faculty *members* of their right to forward a *individual and/or collective* dissenting reports if they do not agree with the head’s findings.

Draft, p. 27

... the evaluation should include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions. All committee reports should list the entire membership....

The numerical vote of each committee should be reported.

Proposed

... the evaluation *must* include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions. All committee reports *must* list the entire membership....

The numerical vote of each committee *must* be reported.

Draft, p. 28, “General Information” (line 5)

... coming year. Each faculty member’s annual performance-and-planning review ...

RATIONALE: This statement appears in the *Handbook* section on Annual Performance-and-Planning Review and at the same place in terms of other statements in that text. Including it would make the Manual a complete reflection of the *Handbook* policy statements. It appears to be the only statement in the *Handbook* for this section that does not appear in the Manual.

Proposed

... coming year. *The results of these evaluations will be used to reward faculty performance.* Each faculty member’s annual performance-and-planning review ...

Draft, p. 28, “General Information” (line 5)

Each faculty member’s annual performance-and-planning review should proceed from guidelines and criteria contained in the UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation and departmental and collegiate by-laws that are appropriate to the department, college, and campus.

Proposed

Each faculty member’s annual performance-and-planning review *must* proceed from guidelines and criteria contained in the UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation and *appropriate departmental and collegiate bylaws.*

Draft, p. 28, “Review Materials” (1st bullet)

- A summary of the past year’s expectations as discussed with the department head at the last annual performance-and-planning review;

Proposed

- A summary of the past year’s *accomplishments with the plans and goals developed in conjunction with the department head at the previous year’s annual review;*

Draft, p. 28, “Review Materials” (new 3rd bullet)**Proposed**

- *A listing of specific plans and goals or anticipated accomplishments for the upcoming year;*

Draft, p. 28, “Review Materials” (3rd bullet)

... department by-laws ...

Proposed

... department *bylaws* ...

Draft, p. 28, “Review Materials” (3rd bullet)

- ... This documentation may include information such as teaching evaluations, publications, etc.;

Proposed

- ... This documentation may include information *supporting accomplishments in teaching, research/creative achievement/ scholarship, and service.*

RATIONALE: The description of the types of information in the existing statement is casual and vague, lists only publications as a indicator of scholarly achievement, and excludes service. The importance of proper documentation at this stage of evaluation is not conveyed even though it is just as important as that for promotion and tenure. The documentation requirements specified for the promotion and tenure process provide appropriate guidance.

Draft, p. 28, “Review Process” (line 1)

The faculty member and department head meet to discuss the faculty member’s previous year’s performance and to plan the faculty member’s activities for the upcoming year.

Proposed

The faculty member and department head meet to discuss the faculty member’s previous year’s performance *relative to the plans and goals previously established for the year*, and to plan the faculty member’s activities for the upcoming year.

Draft, p. 29, “Responsibilities ... Faculty” (1st bullet)

... activities and outputs in teaching ...

Proposed

... activities and ~~outputs~~ in teaching ...

Draft, p. 29, “Responsibilities ... Faculty” (4th bullet)

- Preparing, if appropriate, a written rebuttal to the review and providing copies to the department head and the dean;

RATIONALE: The quoted language is inconsistent with the 6th bulleted item on p. 30: “• Forwarding copies of any rebuttals to the dean;.” We believe the 2nd process is correct, that the rebuttal should be a part of the dossier.

Proposed

- Preparing, if appropriate, a written rebuttal to the review and providing *a copy* to the department head ~~and the dean~~;

Draft, p. 29, “Responsibilities ... Head” (1st bullet)

- Scheduling the annual performance-and-planning review:

RATIONALE: We propose below adding to Appendix E a new section, “Schedule for Annual Planning and Performance Evaluation,” which would follow the timetable in the Senate’s 5th resolution adopted on February 1, 1999 (http://web.utk.edu/~senate/Tenure_2-1-99.html).

Proposed

- Scheduling the annual performance-and-planning review *according to the schedule in Appendix E, Section A.*

Draft, p. 30, “Responsibilities ... Head”

Proposed

[add a new bulleted item, between “preparing” and “forwarding”:] *Preparing a document stating the plans and expectations of the faculty member for the coming year. A written record shall be maintained of the faculty member’s awareness of any subsequent changes to the statement of plans and expectations;*

RATIONALE: Under Review Materials on page 28, a faculty member is told to provide the department head with “A summary of the past year’s expectations as discussed with the department head at the last annual performance-and-planning review.” In addition, the first sentence under Review Process on page 28 states: “The faculty member and department head meet to discuss the faculty member’s previous year’s performance and *to plan the faculty member’s activities for the upcoming year*” (emphasis added). Where does the written record of the plans and expectations for the coming year appear in the process? In addition, is there any process for documentation of any changes that the department head might make in those expectations after the annual review session?

Draft, p. 30, “Responsibilities ... Head” (3rd bullet)

Proposed

- Forwarding signed copies of the summary document to the faculty member and the dean;

- Forwarding signed copies of the summary document to the faculty member and the dean. *Each page of this document must be signed by the faculty member and the department head; in cases where the attachment exceeds one page, the pages should be numbered, indicating total pages.*

RATIONALE: If this were a one-page form, then the signature acknowledging receipt on that page would be sufficient. A signature on a cover page would not verify receipt of all pages of a multi-page document, however. Only by signing (or initialing) and dating each page and numbering pages in terms of total pages will there be a verifiable record of information and what the faculty member received. (Note that the next item addresses the same problem.)

Draft, p. 30, “Responsibilities ... Head” (3rd bullet)

Proposed

- Forwarding signed copies of the summary document to the faculty member and the dean;

- Forwarding signed copies of the summary document (*the cover sheet and all attachments*) to the faculty member and the dean;

RATIONALE: A definition of the term “summary document” would remove possible ambiguity about whether the term only refers to the rating form. (Note that the previous item addresses the same problem.)

Draft, p. 31, “(Cover Sheet)” (line 1)

Proposed

FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION
REPORT

FACULTY ANNUAL *PERFORMANCE AND
PLANNING* REPORT

Draft, p. 31, “(Cover Sheet)” (line 7)
... by-laws ...

Proposed
... *bylaws* ...

Draft, p. 31, “(Cover Sheet)” (line 8)
... university.

Proposed
... university, *and summarizing the plans and goals established during the annual review conference.*

Draft, p. 31, “(Cover Sheet)” (lines -6, -5)

Proposed

*Signature of faculty member: ...
Signature of department head: ...

[reverse order]

RATIONALE: The reversal would follow the order of steps as they are to occur in the process: (1) that the department head completes the report and then signs it, and (2) then the department head gives the report to the faculty member to sign. It also would give visual emphasis to the explanatory note about what the faculty signature means.

Draft, p. 31, “(Cover Sheet)” (line -3)

Proposed

*The faculty member’s signature does not necessarily indicate the faculty member’s agreement with the content of the review document.

*The faculty member’s signature *acknowledges receipt of the review document and does not necessarily indicate the faculty member’s agreement with its content.*

RATIONALE: The current statement is incomplete since it only indicates what the faculty signature does not mean. Since the faculty member is required to sign the form, it is important that the accompanying explanation indicate what the person’s signature does mean. The substitute language is consistent with that on page 28.

Draft, p. 31, “(Cover Sheet)” (line -1)

Proposed

The department head should give a copy of this review summary to faculty member reviewed.

The department head *must* give a copy of this *completed cover sheet and all attachments* to faculty member reviewed.

RATIONALE: The reference on the form itself to “this review summary” could be interpreted as applying only to that sheet. The term “(Cover Sheet)” at the top may be intended as a clarification of the point, but it is indirect.

Draft, p. 31, “(Cover Sheet)” (line -1)

Proposed

The department head should give a copy ...

The department head *must* give a *signed* copy ...

RATIONALE: Providing the faculty member a signed copy is mandated under the Review Process on pages 28-29 and Responsibilities of the Department Head on page 30 (paragraph 3). Including it on the form itself would serve as a reminder to both the department head and the faculty member of this provision.

Draft, p. 32, “Part IV”

Cumulative Reviews

Proposed

[Be consistent in capitalization, preferably using lower case where possible.]

Draft, p. 32, “General” (line 2)

Cumulative Reviews shall occur regularly every five years.

ProposedCumulative reviews shall occur regularly every five years. *Criteria and any special procedures used in the selection of faculty for review during the first five years of this process shall be stated in writing and approved by the Faculty Senate.*

RATIONALE: Until such time that the provision for conducting reviews “regularly every five years” can become operable, selection of faculty for review will involve other factors not currently specified in the Manual.

Draft, p. 32, “General” (line 9)

...departmental by-laws ...

Proposed...departmental *bylaws* ...**Draft, p. 32, “General” (line 14)****Proposed**

[add a new 3rd paragraph:] *Faculty members whose performance is found through the cumulative review process to exceed or meet expectations for rank are eligible for pay increments according to levels established by the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.*

RATIONALE: This statement is in the new *Faculty Handbook* section that incorporates the Trustees’ tenure policy. The recommended placement in the Manual follows the same statement that it follows in the *Handbook*.

Draft, p. 32, “Review” (2nd bullet)

... cumulative review (this amounts to annual review materials ...

Proposed

... cumulative review (i.e., annual review materials ...

Draft, p. 32, “Review” (3rd bullet)

- Documentation, not included in the annual review summaries, that is requested by the department head or required by college and/or department bylaws that supports the faculty member’s activities since the last cumulative review;

Proposed

- Documentation not included in the annual review summaries that is requested by the department head or required by college and/or department bylaws that supports the faculty member’s activities since the last cumulative review;

RATIONALE: The Evaluation Manual must identify the materials on which an evaluation is to be based. The deleted language is vague and grants to department heads unacceptable authority to assemble evidence in support of a predetermined judgment. See also the comments below on the Draft, p. 34 (3rd bullet).

Draft, p. 33, “Review Process” (No. 3)

... strengths and weaknesses in performance.

Proposed

... strengths and weaknesses in performance.

The faculty member being reviewed shall be provided the opportunity to read and comment on the evaluation by the peer review committee when it is forwarded to the department head.

Draft, p. 33, “Review Process” (No. 4)

... writes an evaluation of the faculty member.

Proposed

... writes an evaluation of the faculty member.

The faculty member being reviewed shall be provided the opportunity to read and comment on the evaluation by the department head.

Draft, p. 33, “Responsibilities ... Faculty” (1st bullet)

• ... which should include activities and outputs in teaching ...

Proposed

• ... which should include activities and outputs in teaching ...

Draft, p. 33, “Responsibilities ... Faculty” (2nd bullet)

• Reviewing all materials on which the cumulative review will be based;

Proposed

• Reviewing *for accuracy and completeness the factual records and information material* on which the cumulative review will be based;

RATIONALE: The meaning of “reviewing” can be subject to more than one interpretation. If the purpose of this review is to be the same as that under the tenure and promotion review (page 9, item #2 under Role of the Faculty Member ...), which is to review the materials for completeness and accuracy, then it should be stated here as well.

Draft, p. 33, “Responsibilities ... Faculty” (4th bullet)

• Reading and commenting on the evaluation by the peer review committee and on the evaluation by the department head.

Proposed

• Reading and commenting on the evaluation by the peer review committee *when it is forwarded to the department head* and on the evaluation by the department head.

Draft, p. 33, “Responsibilities ... Faculty” (4th bullet)

• Reading and commenting on the evaluation by the peer review committee and on the evaluation by the department head.

Proposed

[move this item as revised according to the previous recommendation to the 3rd position in the list of four bulleted items]

Draft, p. 34 (1st bullet)

- Scheduling the cumulative review;

RATIONALE: While the extent of advance notice needed will vary by department (and could require as much as 1 years if one suggestion in Appendix A is followed), a set timetable will help provide equal treatment of all faculty.

Proposed

- Scheduling the cumulative review *according to an established timetable that provides sufficient notice so that the faculty member has adequate time to prepare the required materials;*

Draft, p. 34 (3rd bullet)

- Soliciting any information concerning the faculty member's performance ...

RATIONALE: As with Draft, p. 32, "Review" (3rd bullet) above, this item grants to the department head unchecked opportunity to "solicit" information damaging to the faculty member. The materials on which a professional judgment is to be based must be specified in the Evaluation Manual. Accordingly, we recommend replacing the existing item with the language used at the top of Draft, p. 30.

Proposed

- *Informing the faculty member of what materials must be included and the format to be used for submission of materials for the review;*

Draft, p. 34 (3rd bullet)

... departmental by-laws ...

Proposed

... departmental *bylaws* ...

Draft, p. 34**Proposed**

[add a new bulleted item—in 5th position in the list, between "Appointing ..." and "assessing ...":]
 • *Providing the faculty member the opportunity to read and comment on the evaluation by the peer review committee when it is forwarded to the department head;*

Draft, p. 34 (6th bullet)

- Preparing a summary report of the cumulative review;

RATIONALE: The Department Head is not summarizing the report of the review committee; in fact, he or she may disagree with that report. The responsibility of the Head is to prepare an evaluation that is informed by the report of the review committee but that represents the best judgment of the Head.

Proposed

- Preparing a *written evaluation of the performance of the faculty member;*

Draft, p. 34 (7th bullet)

- Providing the faculty member the opportunity to read and comment on the evaluation by the peer review committee and to read and comment on the evaluation by the department head;

Proposed

- Providing the faculty member the opportunity ~~to read and comment on the evaluation by the peer review committee and~~ to read and comment on the evaluation by the department head;

Draft, p. 34 (8th bullet)

- Providing all reports and comments on the reports to the dean and maintaining copies in the faculty member's departmental files;

Proposed

- Providing *copies of all* reports and comments on the reports to the *faculty member and to the* dean and maintaining copies in the faculty member's departmental files;

RATIONALE: The right of a faculty member to receive copies of all signed evaluations is directly stated only on the form for the Peer Cumulative Faculty Evaluation Report (page 36, last line). The language in the text of the Manual that indicates that the faculty member is to be given "the opportunity to read" the evaluations could be interpreted to mean receiving a copy. On the other hand, it is possible to give someone the opportunity to read a document without giving the person a copy of it.

Draft, p. 35 (line 1)

... prepares a summary report according to a form developed by the campus to evaluate the faculty member's performance.

Proposed

... prepares a summary report according to a form developed by the campus *and approved by the Faculty Senate* to evaluate the faculty member's performance.

RATIONALE: The *Handbook* section with the Trustee policy specifies that the department head "prepares a summary report according to a form developed by the campus to evaluate the faculty member's performance." This language does not appear under the Responsibilities of the Department Head in paragraph 6 on page 34 ("Preparing a summary report of the cumulative review") although it is included under Unsatisfactory Performance on lines 1 and 2 of page 35. A form for the Peer Cumulative Faculty Evaluation Report to be signed by the peer review committee appears on page 36 of the Manual, but there is no form for the department head.

Draft, p. 35

- ...
- ...

Proposed

[reverse the order a and b]

Draft, p. 36 "(Cover Sheet)"

Signature of faculty member: ...

Proposed

* Signature of faculty member: ...

[to be added below signature lines and above "* The department head ...":]

**The faculty member's signature acknowledges receipt of the review document and does not necessarily indicate the faculty member's agreement with its content.*

Draft, p. 36 “(Cover Sheet)” (line -1)

* The department head should give a copy of this review summary to faculty member reviewed.

Proposed

* The department head *must* give a copy of this review summary to *the* faculty member reviewed.

Draft, p. 37, “Goals and Approach” (line 3)

... work place ...

Proposed

... *workplace* ...

Draft, p. 46, “Publications” (4th bullet)

Articles in Refereed Journals ...

Proposed

[reword for consistency with changes at Draft, p. 18, “Research” (2nd bullet)]

Draft, p. 47

Proposed

SELECTED PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS [side heading to be added]

Draft, p. 48, “Appendix E”

Tenure and Promotion Calendar

Proposed

Planning and Evaluation Calendar

Draft, p. 48

Proposed

[Add a new section A, relettering the existing sections accordingly. The new section, “Schedule for Annual Planning and Performance Evaluation,” would follow the timetable in the Senate’s 5th resolution adopted on February 1, 1999 (http://web.utk.edu/~senate/Tenure_2-1-99.html).

Draft, p. 48, “Schedule ... Promotion”

Late September Promotion and Tenure
Workshop-Department Heads

Late September Promotion and Tenure
Workshop-Department Heads

Proposed

[either explain that the intent is to hold two workshops or delete the redundant 2nd line.]

Draft, p. 48, “Calendar” (section B. 3)

For all other tenure-track faculty not under review for tenure/promotion during a given academic year:

Late January	Deadline for Departmental recommendation to the College, whether to retain for at least one more year or definitely <i>not</i> to retain after July 31
Mid March	Deadline for College recommendation to Academic Affairs Office
Mid May	Deadline for the Vice Chancellor to notify anyone who will not be retained after July 31

Proposed

For all other tenure-track faculty not under review for tenure/promotion during a given academic year:

Late January	Deadline for Departmental recommendation to the College, whether to retain for at least one more year or definitely <i>not</i> to retain after July 31 <i>of the subsequent academic year</i>
Mid March	Deadline for College recommendation to Academic Affairs Office
Mid May	Deadline for the Vice Chancellor to notify anyone who will not be retained after July 31 <i>of the subsequent academic year</i>

RATIONALE: The *Faculty Handbook* follows AAUP guidelines in requiring that probationary faculty who are not going to be retained after two or more years of service be given notice of nonrenewal at least twelve months before the expiration of the appointment. It is not possible to notify such faculty in mid-May that their terms will end on July 31. Cf. the draft Evaluation Manual, p. 3.

Draft, p. 48, “Calendar”**Proposed**

[Add a section D, Schedule for Cumulative Review.]

The Faculty Affairs Committee objects to any suggestion in the Evaluation Manual that the current CTEP or a program resembling it will constitute the student assessment portion of the evaluation of teaching. That matter is before the Senate for debate and decision this year. If a table of CTEP data is to be included in the Evaluation Manual, the Committee recommends two changes in the version of the table that appears as p. 3 in the memorandum from Dr. Woods dated 9/29/99. First, we recommend that the next-to-last column represent “Teaching Effectiveness” rather than “Interest Effectiveness.” And second, we recommend that the table include information about the percentage of students enrolled in the class who participated in the CTEP ratings.

Finally, the Faculty Affairs Committee reaffirms the recommendations it made in January 1999 concerning the review committee and the criteria to be employed by the review committee in initiating a development plan. Those two sections of the Faculty Affairs Committee’s report are reproduced on the following page. We strongly recommend (1) a concrete statement of the procedures to be followed by the review committee; (2) a definition of “consensus”—we recommend that consensus be understood to mean unanimity—and an explanation of the criteria for choosing termination rather than development; and (3) a specific record of all material efforts made prior to the formation of the review committee to assist the faculty member in professional development.

**Review
Committee**

The Trustees' policy provides that a department head shall convene a Review Committee to examine the performance of any faculty member whose work in two consecutive annual reviews or in one cumulative review has been judged to be unsatisfactory; the Review Committee shall conduct a "rigorous and thorough review" of the faculty member's work, perhaps leading to a judgment that the work of the faculty member has been unsatisfactory and then to a recommendation by an action group that termination proceedings be initiated. We find Jordan Kurland's comment on this provision to be cogent: "Beyond providing for a review committee with widespread membership to conduct this review, the document is silent on what is to make this review 'rigorous and thorough' as distinct from the two previous reviews that resulted in an 'unsatisfactory' rating." Accordingly, and in view of the gravity of the decision the Review Committee is asked to make, we recommend that the task force develop a description of the Review Committee process that is as specific as to the procedures the Committee is to follow and the protections afforded to the tenured faculty member as is the description of the Cumulative Performance Review.

**Criteria for
Initiating a
"Development
Plan"**

If one cumulative review or two consecutive annual reviews result in ratings of unsatisfactory, the automatically-triggered Review Committee will judge the work of the faculty member. If the Review Committee also concludes that the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory, an action group consisting of the department head, the Dean, the Vice Chancellor, and the Senate President or Senate Executive Committee will consider the case. The Trustees' policy (Tenure.G.3) says the action group "shall reach consensus on one of two actions"—initiation of a development plan in order to try to rescue the faculty member or direct movement to termination proceedings. The Trustees' document is silent as to the substantive and procedural criteria for making that decision. What is a consensus? What happens if the action group fails to "reach consensus"? And most important, what considerations should lead the action group to elect termination rather than an effort at development? We recommend that the task force clarify the standards and procedures for the decision of the action group.