The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT Section E.14.3.2 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE REvised AS FOLLOWS:

E.14.3.2 Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews (last revised June 21, 2011)

A Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review is initiated when the academic supervisor decides that a tenured faculty member’s performance in a Phase I Review was not satisfactory, or it may be initiated as described in Section E.15.4.1. The initiation of a Phase II Review is not grievable by the faculty member. A Phase II Review Committee of at least three (3) five (5) tenured peers at the same or higher rank as the faculty member shall be selected to conduct a comprehensive performance review according to procedures specified in the code of the academic unit. These peers shall be selected from the same academic unit as the faculty member, unless that academic unit is a department that is too small, in which case, some of the peers may be from other departments within the same college. The academic supervisor shall not be a member of the Review Committee, nor shall any other administrator at the same administrative level as the academic supervisor or higher. The procedure for the selection of these peers shall be specified in the code of the academic unit. If the selection procedures are not specified in the code of the academic unit, then a committee of three (3) five (5) tenured peers shall be drawn by lot from the eligible faculty members in the same academic unit as the faculty member. If the academic unit is a small department with fewer than three (3) five (5) eligible faculty members, then
additional tenured peers shall be drawn by lot from the eligible faculty members in
the same college so as to increase the total number of committee members to
three (3) five (5).

The code of each academic unit shall specify:

a. The procedure for the selection of a Phase II Review Committee;

b. Procedures for assuring impartiality and lack of bias among members of the
Phase II Review Committee;

c. The criteria to be used by the Phase II Review Committee, including standards
for evaluation which reflect the overall mission of the academic unit, and which
permit sufficient flexibility to accommodate faculty members with differing
responsibilities, effort distributions, and workloads;

d. The types of information to be submitted by the faculty member being reviewed;
and

e. Any additional information to be used in evaluations, such as peer evaluations
and student opinions of teaching.

As a result of a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review, one (1) of the
following three (3) outcomes shall be selected by a majority of the Phase II Review
Committee:

a. The faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty
performance, as identified by their academic unit;

b. There are deficiencies, but they are not judged to be substantial and chronic or
recurrent;

c. There are deficiencies that are substantial and chronic or recurrent.
Regardless of the outcome, the Review Committee shall prepare a written report and provide the faculty member with a copy. If the second outcome is selected, the written report may recommend that the academic supervisor design a specific professional development plan to assist the faculty member in meeting expectations. If the third outcome is selected, then the written report shall explain what deficiencies led to that selection.

For either of the first two (2) outcomes, no further action is necessary. For the third outcome, taking into account the faculty member’s actions, prior actions and history, and whether a pattern exists, the committee’s written report shall recommend whether or not disciplinary action should be pursued as described in Section E.15.

The faculty member shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report. For informational purposes, both the report and the faculty member’s response shall be forwarded to the academic supervisor, and, at successive steps, to each higher supervisor, ending with the Provost.

If the Review Committee selects the third outcome and identifies deficiencies that need to be remedied, the academic supervisor shall design a specific professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and setting time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor on the design of this plan. This development plan shall be submitted to the next higher administrative level for approval, and the faculty member shall be given a copy of the approved plan. This professional development plan shall be considered to be part of the faculty member’s official Personnel File (see footnote #2 regarding official Personnel File).

**Rationale:** The Committee must now include at least five members. The current requirement of only three members has led to significant problems in interpreting
the meaning of a 2-1 vote. Is this like a 5-1 vote, with one faculty member who is out of line with the rest of the department, or is it like a 5-4 vote with a significant fraction of the faculty on each side.