

6
7
8
9 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
10 **Amendment G to S15-7 (RTP Procedures)**
11 **Clarifying the period of review for Periodic “Annual”**
12 **Reviews for Probationary Faculty**
13
14

15 Resolved: That S15-7 be amended as shown by the addition of a sentence as shown
16 underlined in the following excerpt from the policy.
17

18 *Rationale: Definitions and explanation of the process: During their probationary period,*
19 *tenure track faculty undergo a number of major “performance reviews”*
20 *which determine whether they will be retained, granted tenure, or promoted.*
21 *The contract and our policy specifies that in those years in which faculty do*
22 *not undergo one of these major “performance reviews” they instead undergo*
23 *a smaller “periodic” or annual review. These periodic reviews are*
24 *sometimes call “mini” reviews. These smaller review are intended to be*
25 *formative and developmental—giving faculty feedback so as to help faculty*
26 *stay on track toward tenure.*

27
28 *The problem: In order to provide probationary faculty with quality feedback*
29 *as they progress toward tenure, a periodic review needs to examine all of*
30 *the faculty member’s achievements since the last review. However, due to*
31 *the imbalanced calendar in which full performance reviews begin in the fall*
32 *while the smaller periodic reviews begin in the spring, there are*
33 *circumstances in which some achievements “fall through the cracks” and*
34 *are not captured in the cycle of periodic reviews. (Note that this is a*
35 *problem only for the periodic reviews, since the full performance reviews are*
36 *cumulative and comprehensive.) For example, if a faculty member submits*
37 *a full performance review in October of 2017, the next periodic review would*
38 *not be due until AY 2018-19, an be submitted in March 2019.*

39
40 *Since there is no definition of the timespan to be covered by the “periodic*
41 *review” there have been a number of different interpretations developed*
42 *over the years. At one point it was assumed that the periodic review*
43 *covered materials only for that particular Academic Year. In the case of the*
44 *example above, this would omit all the material produced from October 2017*
45 *through August 2018. More recently a better interpretation has prevailed*

46 *which is that the periodic review should cover the two prior semesters.*
47 *While an improvement, this still would omit materials from October through*
48 *December of the prior year, unless they were included through the “late add”*
49 *process and thus reviewed during the prior performance review.*

50
51 *The solution: We add a simple sentence that defines the period of review to*
52 *include all materials since the last review.*

53
54 *Approved: April 23, 2018*
55 *Vote: 10-0-0*
56 *Present: Chin, He, Marachi, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Donahue, Pyeon,*
57 *Kimbarow*
58 *Absent: None*
59 *Financial Impact: No direct impacts.*
60 *Workload Impact: No direct impacts.*

61

62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amending S15-7 (RTP Procedures)
Clarifying the period of review for Periodic “Annual”
Reviews for Probationary Faculty

...
...
...

2.2.2 Normally, probationary faculty shall submit annual summaries of achievements for periodic evaluation every year in which they do not submit a full performance review. The annual summary shall cover achievements since the last review (whether a performance review or a periodic evaluation,) or the appointment date if there has not yet been a review. Department committees, department chairs, and college deans shall consider an annual summary of achievements prepared by the faculty member, evaluations of teaching, and the cumulative record of previous evaluations and recommendations by committees and administrators. Copies of their observations and suggestions shall be given to the faculty member; the original evaluation shall be placed in the official Personnel Action File, and copies included in subsequent years' dossiers.