

<b>UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY</b> <b>ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS</b>	<small>IDENTIFICATION</small> <b>AR II-1.0-11</b>	<small>PAGE</small> <b>1</b>
	<small>DATE EFFECTIVE</small> <b>12/16/00</b>	<small>SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED</small>

## **TENURED FACULTY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

This policy is designed to provide definitive guidance to units in supporting tenured faculty to increase their productivity and to identify and address problems in performance.

This policy builds on the current system for conducting regular performance or “merit” reviews, as defined in AR II-1.0-5, of tenured faculty for purposes of salary increases. It requires the following:

A Consequential Review process must be instituted for any faculty member receiving successive unsatisfactory performance or “merit” reviews in a “significant area of work”. For the purposes of this policy, a significant area of work is defined as a Distribution of Effort Agreement greater than 20% in the areas of instruction, research or service. The review is summative in nature and requires a plan to improve performance within a specified period.

Upon recommendation of the department chairperson and approval of the dean, a faculty member subject to evaluation under this plan may be exempted if there are extenuating circumstances (such as health problems). A decision by the chairperson not to recommend such exemption may be appealed to the Dean. A Consequential Review will not be undertaken until the final disposition of any appeal.

The Dean shall notify the faculty member and department chairperson of the initiation of a Consequential Review process and of the procedures of the review.

For a faculty member selected for Consequential Review, the department chairperson shall prepare a review dossier in consultation with the faculty member. The faculty member has the right and obligation to provide for the review dossier all the documents, materials, and statements he or she believes to be relevant and necessary for the review, and all materials submitted shall be included in the dossier. Ordinarily, such a dossier would include at least the following: an up-to-date vita, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research or creative work. The chairperson shall add to the dossier any further materials (prior evaluations, other documents, etc.) he or she deems relevant, in every case providing the faculty member with a copy of each item added. The faculty member shall have the right to add any material, including statements and additional documents, at any time during the review process.

The Consequential Review will be conducted by the department chairperson, or at the request of the faculty member by a three-member ad hoc committee consisting of tenured faculty members including one member selected by the Dean, one member chosen by the faculty member, one member selected by the college faculty.

It is not the purpose of the Consequential Review to evaluate the performance of the faculty member but rather to develop a plan to remedy the deficiencies indicated in the performance reviews. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to recommend the plan that has been developed to the Dean for approval and to monitor the implementation of the plan approved by the Dean. Ideally, the plan should grow out of an iterative collaboration among the faculty member, department chairperson and Dean. The review should be completed within 60 days of notification of the initiation of the review.

It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan once it is adopted. In the event that the faculty member objects to the terms of the plan, the faculty member may appeal to the appropriate Chancellor. Once the appeal has been resolved, the resulting plan will be implemented.

The plan must:

- 1) Identify the specific deficiencies to be addressed
- 2) Define specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies
- 3) Outline the activities that are to be undertaken to achieve the needed outcomes
- 4) Set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving the outcomes
- 5) Indicate the criteria for annual progress reviews
- 6) Identify the level and source of any funding which may be required to implement the development plan.

The faculty member and his or her department chairperson should meet each semester to review the faculty member's progress towards remedying the deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the Dean.

Further evaluation of the faculty member within the regular faculty performance evaluation processes of the University may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the plan.

When the objectives of the plan have been met, or in any case no later than three years after the start of the plan, a final report will be prepared by the department chairperson and given to the faculty member. The faculty member will be provided an opportunity to comment on the report if he or she wishes. The faculty member's input will become part of the report submitted to the Dean. If the chairperson states that the objectives of the plan have not been fully met and the faculty member disagrees, the three-member ad hoc committee of tenured faculty members involved in the development of the plan shall be reconvened. If a person who was part of that three-member ad hoc committee is no longer available to serve, his or her successor shall be chosen in the same manner as the original person was chosen. The three-member ad hoc committee will then meet and prepare a report for the Dean. Both the chairperson's report and

the report of the three-member ad hoc committee shall be forwarded to the dean, together with any written comments that the faculty member wishes to add, for the dean's final decision.

In those cases where serious deficiencies continue to exist after the Consequential Review plans are completed, dismissal for cause procedures may be initiated.

Each academic unit may create a process for a Developmental Review of tenured faculty, consistent with criteria in AR II-1.0-1, that includes setting individual faculty goals in collaboration with unit chairpersons, deans, and senior faculty colleagues. These reviews should be incorporated into the current performance review process for tenured faculty to minimize administrative burden.

Each chancellor and dean shall develop a process for allocating additional funds as appropriate to provide necessary support for faculty members undertaking a Consequential or Developmental Review.

Each dean shall prepare annually a summary report on cases resulting from the implementation of the Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy in that college and transmit the report to the chancellor.