

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Adjusting the timing of Performance Reviews**
10 **During the transition to the new system for**
11 **Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)**
12 **Amends S15-7 (RTP Procedures)**
13

14
15 Resolved: That the following be inserted as a sixth and final resolved clause to S15-7,
16 and be edited into the public copies of S15-7:
17

18 ***Resolved: Any probationary faculty member who has completed a***
19 ***performance review under S98-8 prior to Fall 2016 (e.g.,***
20 ***received a second year review during AY 2015-16 or***
21 ***earlier) shall continue to be reviewed under the timeline***
22 ***(2-4-6) begun under the old policy until the tenure***
23 ***decision is completed. The AVP for Faculty Affairs, in***
24 ***consultation with the Professional Standards Committee,***
25 ***shall be further empowered to adjust the implementation***
26 ***of this policy to accommodate other issues that may arise***
27 ***as a result of the transition from S98-8 to S15-7. This***
28 ***clause will expire at the end of AY 2019-20.***

29
30
31 ***Rationale: One of the reasons PS recommended that our RTP policies be adopted a***
32 ***year in advance of their implementation was to give the campus sufficient***
33 ***time and notice to anticipate implementation issues and head off problems.***
34 ***One such issue has been detected and this amendment will correct the***
35 ***problem.***
36

37 ***Under our old policy, probationary faculty were reviewed in their 2nd and 4th***
38 ***probationary years prior to the final tenure decision being made in their 6th***
39 ***year. Under the new policy they will be reviewed in their 3rd year, with the***
40 ***possibility of an additional review in their 4th or 5th year, prior to the final and***
41 ***decisive review in their 6th year. The problem concerns the transition to the***
42 ***new system for people who have already started their review cycle under***
43 ***the old system.***
44

45 ***Under S98-8 (the old policy) faculty who are in their 2nd year this year are***
46 ***being reviewed. Next year S15-7 goes into effect and all 3rd year faculty are***
47 ***to be reviewed. This would mean that this cohort of faculty would be***
48 ***reviewed two years in a row.***
49

50 ***A worse problem is that faculty who are currently in their 3rd year will miss***
51 ***both the 3rd year review of the new policy and the 4th year review of the old***

52 *policy, and progress to the final tenure decision without having had any full*
53 *review.*

54
55 *What this simple amendment does is to keep all faculty who have started*
56 *their review cycle on the old timeline on the same 2-4-6 timeline. This*
57 *eliminates both of the problems just mentioned. Faculty who are currently in*
58 *their 1st year, however, will be the first cohort to fully utilize the new 3+ 6*
59 *review cycle.*

60
61 *One very important note: the timing of reviews is completely unrelated to a*
62 *faculty member's privilege to choose between the old and new Criteria and*
63 *Standards during the transitional period. Staying with the old timing cycle*
64 *does not necessarily mean staying with the old Criteria and Standards—this*
65 *remains a faculty member's choice.*

66
67 *The final sentence in this amendment adds a temporary "elastic clause" to*
68 *the policy to allow the AVP for Faculty Affairs to make additional*
69 *adjustments that may be required during implementation. We hope that this*
70 *may prevent the need to come to the Senate with additional amendments*
71 *for temporary issues during the transition.*

72
73
74
75 *Approved: (August 31, 2015)*

76
77 *Vote: (7-0-0)*

78
79 *Present: (Peter, Green, White, Lee, Cuellar, Virick, Kauppila)*

80
81 *Absent: (Riley)*

82
83 *Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.*

84
85 *Workload Impact: No changes over the previous policy. The transition to a system which*
86 *might involve fewer reviews would be delayed, but it is hard to estimate any impacts.*