I. Approve Policy 4.6.5, Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

II. Issue

The proposal is to adopt a revision of Policy 4.6.5.

III. Background

The revision of this policy has been a one-year process that utilized a drafting team consisting of representatives from all five colleges and the Libraries. A revision of the policy creates a clearer, more streamlined process, clarifies the appeals process and creates greater alignment with Policy 4.6.4, Tenure and Promotion.

IV. Alternatives

The alternatives are to maintain the current Policy 4.6.5 or to revise the proposed Policy 4.6.5.

V. President’s Recommendation

Based upon the recommendations of the Chairs Association, the Faculty Senate, and the Provost Council, the President recommends approval.
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TO: Dr. Doug Whitlock  
President

FROM: Sherry Robinson, Executive Assistant to the Provost

DATE: April 8, 2013

RE: Policy 4.6.5, Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

Executive Summary

Policy 4.6.5, Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty, has been revised to ensure consistency with the newly revised tenure and promotion policy. Below is a summary of the changes to Policy 4.6.5:

- Principles similar to the ones in the T&P policy have been added.
- Like Policy 4.6.4, collegiality is considered in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service.
- General guidelines for the procedures have been added.
- Procedures for first-year faculty have been clarified by adding procedural steps beyond the dean.
- The role of the Department evaluation committee has been changed to provide a recommendation regarding reappointment.
- The policy now clarifies the role of the Department Chair with regard to the evaluation committee.
- The policy now describes what the faculty member must include in the annual evaluation, which is absent in the current policy.
- Like Policy 4.6.4, reconsideration is reserved for the department level and appeal is available at the end of the procedure.
- Reconsideration will be made by the committee or administrator who made the decision, eliminating the awkwardness in the current policy of having a committee that has never made a decision “reconsider” it.
- The grounds of appeal have been expanded to “include arbitrary, capricious, or not supported by factual data” and “academic freedom.”
- The Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee will investigate appeals and will provide a recommendation to the Provost.

The revised policy has been approved by the Faculty Senate, the Chairs Association, and the Provost Council. The policy draft received no comments during the 30-day comment period. Based on the support from the campus community, this policy is now submitted for your consideration and submission to the Board of Regents for final approval. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Presidential Action:
- Recommend approval and submission to the Board of Regents for adoption
- Approve (no Board of Regents approval is required)
- Submit to President’s Cabinet for advisement
- Submit to ________________ for further review, drafting, or stakeholder feedback
- Not approved/ not recommended for submission to the Board of Regents
- Other action recommended

[Signature]  [4/8/13]
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April 3, 2013
8:30 a.m.
Martin Room

Members Present: Ault, Allen; Compton, Melinda; Davis, Tina; Gardner, Betina; Good, Claire; Hickox, Charles; Isaacs, Mona; Moore, Sandra; Phillips, Bill; Pogatshnik, Jerry; Reagle, Michael; Robinson, Sherry; Rogow, Robert; Street, James; Street, Stacey; Taylor, Christiane; Vicc, Janna; Wachtel, Libby; Wade, John; Whitehouse, Deborah; Zeigler, Sara

I. Call to Order
Dr. Janna Vice, Chair, called the meeting to order.

II. Approval of the Minutes
The minutes of the February 6, 2013, meeting were approved as written. The meeting scheduled for March 6, 2013, was canceled.

III. Informational/Discussion Items
1. Provost’s Update
   a. The Academic Affairs Program Review Report has been submitted to Board of Regents Chair Craig Turner, as requested for the Strategic Budget Reallocation review.
   b. An open forum for the third Presidential Candidate, Dr. Alan T. Shao, was held yesterday. He will conclude his campus visit today.

2. Council on Academic Affairs Report
   Curriculum proposals approved by the Council on Academic Affairs on February 21, 2013, and March 21, 2013, were approved by the Provost’s Council.

3. Lectureships Policy, 4.6.10P: The Faculty Senate Rights and Responsibilities Committee compiled data from a survey on lecturers and sent recommendations to the Lectureships Policy Drafting Team for consideration. The draft policy was presented to Faculty Senate on April 1 and will be returned for a vote, on May 6.

IV. Action Items
1. Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty Policy, 4.6.5P
   The Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty Policy, 4.6.5P has been thoroughly vetted.

   A motion was made and approved to adopt Policy, 4.6.5P. The policy will be submitted to the Board of Regents on April 30.

2. Travel Requirements and Procedures Regulation, 6.1.3R
   The Travel Requirements and Procedures Regulation, 6.1.3R has been thoroughly vetted.

   A motion was made and approved to adopt Regulation, 6.1.3R.
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
March 4, 2013
3:30 p.m.

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, March 4, 2013, in the South Ballroom in the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Pressley called the sixth meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:
R. Cleveland, M. Cropper*, W. Hatcher*, L. Heath*, C. Hughes*, S. Hunt, R. Johnson*, I. Slusher*, C. Sommer*, D. Whitlock*

*indicates prior notification of absence
^ALT Terri Loan attended for I. Slusher

Visitors to the Senate: Tina Davis, Registrar; David McFaddin, Government Relations; Rick McGee, Registrar’s Office; Brett Morris, Admissions; Val Parks, PC&G; Sherry Robinson, Provost Office; Elizabeth Wachtel, Enrollment Management; Sara Zeigler, University Programs

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
The February 4, 2013 minutes were approved as written.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Motor Vehicle Use Regulation 9.4.1R. Senator Frisbie moved approval, seconded by Senator Spock. The majority was in favor and the motion carried.

Travel Requirements/Procedures Regulation 6.1.3R. Senator Frisbie moved approval, seconded by Senator Smith. Motion carried.

Motion Opposing Regulations 9.4.1R/6.1.3R. As the issues in both regulations had been addressed, Senators Kopacz and Pogatshnik withdrew the motion opposing regulations 9.4.1R and 6.1.3R.

Policy on Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure Track Faculty. Senator Frisbie moved approval, seconded by Senator O’Brien. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

Report on Government Relations. David McFaddin gave a brief report on Government Relations. The goal of the Government Relations office is to make sure that all constituencies on campus have an opportunity to provide feedback on processes, whether regulatory or legislative, and that the best interests of the university are represented.

Report from Council on Academic Affairs - Senator Vice

Program Revisions
College of Arts and Sciences
1. Environmental Studies B.S. – reduce degree requirements to 120 hours. Update requirements.
2. Wildlife Management B.S. – reduce degree requirements to 120 hours. Update requirements.
3. Chemistry 3+2 Option – 1) Add BIO 378 as a support course for Pre-Pharmacy option.
   2) Drop CHE 425/425L from Pre-Pharmacy, Pre-Dental, Pre-Optometry, Pre-Pathology Assistant or Pre-Medical Option.
Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

Policy Statement

Eastern Kentucky University, as a matter of principle, complies with the AAUP standards for faculty evaluation. These standards establish basic policy and procedural expectations for evaluation of non-tenured tenure-track faculty. At EKU, evaluation of faculty for awarding tenure and promotion is governed by Policy 4.6.4 – Promotion and Tenure.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Colleges
- Departments
- Office of Academic Affairs
- Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty
- Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrators

Policy Background

NA
Policy Procedures

All evaluations shall be completed according to the schedule established by the Provost. The schedule shall permit notification of non reappointment by the dates specified in Policy 4.6.4.

Evaluating First-Year Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

The Chair shall meet with the first-year non-tenured tenure-track faculty member no later than January 15 and will provide written feedback on his/her performance during the academic year to date. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by one of the following:

1. Acceptance of the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Dean.
2. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement shall be submitted to the department chair within five days*. The report and the appended material are forwarded to the Dean.

No later than February 1, the Chair shall submit to the Dean a recommendation for reappointment/terminal contract of full-time faculty members in their first year of service, along with a justification of no more than one page.

THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES APPLY TO FACULTY IN YEARS TWO THROUGH FIVE:

Completing the Evaluation Report for Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (Department Level)

1. In the writing of the evaluation report, the Chair shall indicate the extent of the committee's involvement in the process. The committee shall review the evaluation and may indicate areas of disagreement on the report form.
2. While the department chair is responsible for the evaluation report, he or she may delegate the writing of the report to the Department Evaluation Committee. Should the Chair elect to delegate, the report shall include the extent to which the Chair agrees with the details of the report.

Information to Be Used in Completing the Evaluation Report

1. Self evaluation
2. Peer evaluation
3. Student evaluation data
4. Data from other systematic method(s) for evaluating teaching effectiveness
5. Results of previous evaluations
6. Other information as available

Creating the Department Evaluation Committee

1. Each department shall select a committee(s) to advise the Chair in the writing of the evaluation report for non-tenured tenure-track faculty.
2. The method of selecting the committee shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the Dean. It is expected that the committee will be selected whenever possible from among the senior faculty in the department. Departments which do not have a sufficient number of faculty may select faculty outside the department with the advice and consent of the Dean.
3. The department chair shall chair the committee.
4. Once the committee is selected, the department chair shall announce the names of the committee members to the department and shall report the names of the committee members to the Dean.
Completing the Evaluation Report for Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (Department Chair)

All of the same procedures above shall apply for evaluation of a department chair, with the following differences:

1. The Dean shall take the Chair's place on the department committee and be responsible for the report.
2. An evaluation of administrative performance shall be included.

Completing the Evaluation Report for Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (College Dean)

All of the same procedures above shall apply for a college dean, with the following differences:

1. The Provost shall be responsible for the report and shall appoint an evaluation committee composed of chairs and one faculty member elected from each department of the college.
2. An evaluation of administrative performance shall be included.

Disseminating the Evaluation Report to the Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Member

A copy of the evaluation, including reasons for the recommendation, shall be given to the faculty member immediately.

Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (Department Level)

The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by one of the following:

1. Acceptance of the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Dean.
2. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement shall be submitted to the department chair within five days. The report and the appended material are forwarded to the Dean.
3. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the department promotion and tenure committee.
   a) Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the chair of the committee by the faculty member concerned within five days of receiving the evaluation report from the department chair. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.
   b) The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided in the statement of the faculty member. The committee shall consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make its decision. If the faculty member cannot agree to a meeting date within ten calendar days from receipt of the request for reconsideration, the faculty may forfeit the right to present evidence beyond that furnished in the reconsideration request. The chair of the committee shall inform the faculty member of the committee decision. The original evaluation, all information provided by the faculty member, and the report of the department promotion and tenure committee shall all be forwarded to the Dean.

Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (College Level)

The Dean shall examine all of the material provided by the department.

1. If the Dean concurs with the recommendation of the department, the Dean shall submit the report, with his or her recommendations, to the Provost.
2. If the Dean does not concur with the recommendation of the department, a copy of the Dean's recommendation and the report, including the reasons for that recommendation, shall be given to the faculty member and the department chair. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by one of the following:
   a) Acceptance of recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Provost.
   b) Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement shall be submitted to the Dean within five days. The report and the appended material are forwarded to the Provost.
c) Requesting reconsideration of the report by the college promotion and tenure committee.
   (1) Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the Dean by the department and/or faculty member concerned within five days of receipt of the evaluation report. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.
   (2) The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided by the department and/or faculty member. The committee shall consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make its decision. The Dean will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. All information will be forwarded to the Provost.

**Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (University Level)**

The Provost shall examine all of the material provided by the Dean.
1. After the Provost and President have made their recommendations, the faculty member shall be notified by the department chair. The Chair shall provide a copy of the final report to the faculty member. The faculty member shall sign the last page of the report indicating receipt of a copy of the report.
2. When written notification of non-reappointment or of a terminal contract is necessary, the letter shall be prepared and signed by the President. The letter shall be received not later than the applicable notification date specified in the Faculty Handbook.
3. Any appeal shall be based on procedural grounds and shall be addressed in writing to the Provost within five days of receipt of notification of non-reappointment.

**Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (Department Chair)**

The same reconsideration procedures above shall apply for department chairs, with the following differences:
1. The letter requesting reconsideration shall be addressed to the dean of the college, who shall call a meeting of the college promotion and tenure committee.
2. If the individual is still not satisfied, he or she must write a letter to the Provost, who will appoint a committee to consider the appeal.

Any further appeal shall be directed to the President of the University.

**Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (College Dean)**

The same reconsideration procedures above shall apply for college deans, with the following differences:
1. The letter requesting reconsideration shall be addressed to the Provost, who shall appoint a committee to consider the appeal.

Any further appeal shall be directed to the President of the University.

**Definitions**

**Provost**

Refers to either the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or his/her designee.

**University**

Eastern Kentucky University

**Within Five Days**

Throughout this document "within five days" shall be interpreted to mean no later than the fifth calendar day following the day of notification. If the fifth day occurs on a weekend or holiday, the request for reconsideration or the statement of appeal shall be due on
the first day on which University administrative offices are open.

Responsibilities

Department Chair

- The evaluation of non-tenured tenure-track faculty for years one through five of employment is based on the principle that the department chair is ultimately responsible for the evaluation report. The Chair must ensure that the report is a fair and accurate description of the faculty member's performance including both strengths and weaknesses.
- Each department chair shall provide each first year non-tenured tenure-track faculty member an information copy of the evaluation form (blank) and go over it in some detail prior to the time of evaluation. This shall be done early in the first semester of employment.

Violations of the Policy

NA

Interpreting Authority

- Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
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TO:         President Doug Whitlock
FROM:     Dr. Sherry Robinson
DATE:     April 1, 2010
SUBJECT:  Error in Policy for Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track (4.6.5P)

Yesterday I discovered that last spring, in the process of preparing for Board approval the policy for evaluating non-tenured tenure-track faculty, I inadvertently made an error in language that has an unintended impact on the policy. In the policy procedures, under Creating the Department Evaluation Committee, number 2, the language in the Board-approved policy states: “The method for selected the committee shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time non-tenured faculty . . .” (emphasis mine). This language differs from the language approved by the appropriate bodies that vetted this policy. Below is a chronology along with how I believe the error occurred:

• Original policy passed by the Board in 1986: “shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time tenure track faculty . . .”
• Faculty Senate recommends the revised policy on March 2, 2009 with the following language: “shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time tenure track faculty . . .”
• Provost Council recommends the revised policy on March 4, 2009 with the following language: “shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time tenure track faculty . . .”
• The draft was submitted to the President for recommendation and for Board approval on April 15th along with an Executive Summary. The President recommended changing the title of the policy from “Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty” to “Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty.” I can only speculate, but I believe that in an attempt to use consistent language within the policy, I did a “find and replace” to add “non-tenured” before “tenure track.” In doing so, I apparently changed the reference in a place that should not have been changed.
• The revised policy, with the error in it, went to the Board and was approved in June 2009.

I have conferred with Dr. Vice concerning how to correct this error. We believe that since this error was clerical in nature, and clearly not what was intended by those supporting the policy, that the original language should be restored and that this memo be transmitted to the Faculty Senate Chair, to the Deans, to the University Counsel, and to any others who should be made aware of this action.
Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

Policy Statement

Eastern Kentucky University, as a matter of principle, complies with the AAUP standards for faculty evaluation. These standards establish basic policy and procedural expectations for evaluation of non-tenured tenure-track faculty. At EKU, evaluation of faculty for awarding tenure and promotion is governed by Policy 4.6.4 – Promotion and Tenure.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Colleges
- Departments
- Office of Academic Affairs
- Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty
- Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrators

Policy Background

NA
Policy Procedures

All evaluations shall be completed according to the schedule established by the Provost. The schedule shall permit notification of non-reappointment by the dates specified in Policy 4.6.4.

Evaluating First-Year Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

The Chair shall meet with the first-year non-tenured tenure-track faculty member no later than January 15 and will provide written feedback on his/her performance during the academic year to date. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by one of the following:
1. Acceptance of the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Dean.
2. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement shall be submitted to the department chair within five days*. The report and the appended material are forwarded to the Dean.

No later than February 1, the Chair shall submit to the Dean a recommendation for reappointment/terminal contract of full-time faculty members in their first year of service, along with a justification of no more than one page.

THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES APPLY TO FACULTY IN YEARS TWO THROUGH FIVE:

Completing the Evaluation Report for Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

(Department Level)

1. In the writing of the evaluation report, the Chair shall indicate the extent of the committee's involvement in the process. The committee shall review the evaluation and may indicate areas of disagreement on the report form.
2. While the department chair is responsible for the evaluation report, he or she may delegate the writing of the report to the Department Evaluation Committee. Should the Chair elect to delegate, the report shall include the extent to which the Chair agrees with the details of the report.

Information to Be Used in Completing the Evaluation Report

1. Self evaluation
2. Peer evaluation
3. Student evaluation data
4. Data from other systematic method(s) for evaluating teaching effectiveness
5. Results of previous evaluations
6. Other information as available

Creating the Department Evaluation Committee

1. Each department shall select a committee(s) to advise the Chair in the writing of the evaluation report for non-tenured tenure-track faculty.
2. The method of selecting the committee shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time non-tenured faculty of the department and approved by the Dean. It is expected that the committee will be selected whenever possible from among the senior faculty in the department. Departments which do not have a sufficient number of faculty may select faculty outside the department with the advice and consent of the Dean.
3. The department chair shall chair the committee.
4. Once the committee is selected, the department chair shall announce the names of the committee members to the department and shall report the names of the committee members to the Dean.
Completing the Evaluation Report for Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (Department Chair)

All of the same procedures above shall apply for evaluation of a department chair, with the following differences:
1. The Dean shall take the Chair's place on the department committee and be responsible for the report.
2. An evaluation of administrative performance shall be included.

Completing the Evaluation Report for Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (College Dean)

All of the same procedures above shall apply for a college dean, with the following differences:
1. The Provost shall be responsible for the report and shall appoint an evaluation committee composed of chairs and one faculty member elected from each department of the college.
2. An evaluation of administrative performance shall be included.

Disseminating the Evaluation Report to the Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Member

A copy of the evaluation, including reasons for the recommendation, shall be given to the faculty member immediately.

Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (Department Level)

The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by one of the following:
1. Acceptance of the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Dean.
2. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement shall be submitted to the department chair within five days. The report and the appended material are forwarded to the Dean.
3. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the department promotion and tenure committee. 
   a) Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the chair of the committee by the faculty member concerned within five days of receiving the evaluation report from the department chair. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.
   b) The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided in the statement of the faculty member. The committee shall consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make its decision. If the faculty member cannot agree to a meeting date within ten calendar days from receipt of the request for reconsideration, the faculty may forfeit the right to present evidence beyond that furnished in the reconsideration request. The chair of the committee shall inform the faculty member of the committee decision. The original evaluation, all information provided by the faculty member, and the report of the department promotion and tenure committee shall all be forwarded to the Dean.

Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (College Level)

The Dean shall examine all of the material provided by the department:
1. If the Dean concurs with the recommendation of the department, the Dean shall submit the report, with his or her recommendations, to the Provost.
2. If the Dean does not concur with the recommendation of the department, a copy of the Dean's recommendation and the report, including the reasons for that recommendation, shall be given to the faculty member and the department chair. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by one of the following:
   a) Acceptance of recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Provost.
   b) Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement shall be submitted to the Dean within five days. The report and the appended material are forwarded to the Provost.
c) Requesting reconsideration of the report by the college promotion and tenure committee.
   (1) Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the Dean by the department and/or faculty member concerned within five days of receipt of the evaluation report. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.
   (2) The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided by the department and/or faculty member. The committee shall consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make its decision. The Dean will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. All information will be forwarded to the Provost.

Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (University Level)
The Provost shall examine all of the material provided by the Dean.
   1. After the Provost and President have made their recommendations, the faculty member shall be notified by the department chair. The Chair shall provide a copy of the final report to the faculty member. The faculty member shall sign the last page of the report indicating receipt of a copy of the report.
   2. When written notification of non reappointment or of a terminal contract is necessary, the letter shall be prepared and signed by the President. The letter shall be received not later than the applicable notification date specified in the Faculty Handbook.
   3. Any appeal shall be based on procedural grounds and shall be addressed in writing to the Provost within five days of receipt of notification of non-reappointment.

Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (Department Chair)
The same reconsideration procedures above shall apply for department chairs, with the following differences:
   1. The letter requesting reconsideration shall be addressed to the dean of the college, who shall call a meeting of the college promotion and tenure committee.
   2. If the individual is still not satisfied, he or she must write a letter to the Provost, who will appoint a committee to consider the appeal.
Any further appeal shall be directed to the President of the University.

Responding to the Evaluation Report for a Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (College Dean)
The same reconsideration procedures above shall apply for college deans, with the following differences:
   1. The letter requesting reconsideration shall be addressed to the Provost, who shall appoint a committee to consider the appeal.
Any further appeal shall be directed to the President of the University.

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Refers to either the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or his/her designee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Five Days</td>
<td>Throughout this document &quot;within five days&quot; shall be interpreted to mean no later than the fifth calendar day following the day of notification. If the fifth day occurs on a weekend or holiday, the request for reconsideration or the statement of appeal shall be due on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the first day on which University administrative offices are open.

**Responsibilities**

**Department Chair**

- The evaluation of non-tenured tenure-track faculty for years one through five of employment is based on the principle that the department chair is ultimately responsible for the evaluation report. The Chair must ensure that the report is a fair and accurate description of the faculty member's performance including both strengths and weaknesses.

- Each department chair shall provide each first year non-tenured tenure-track faculty member an information copy of the evaluation form (blank) and go over it in some detail prior to the time of evaluation. This shall be done early in the first semester of employment.

**Violations of the Policy**

NA

**Interpreting Authority**

- Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs

**Relevant Links**

**Policy Adoption Review and Approval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Policy Date</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 2009</td>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2009</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2009</td>
<td>Provost Council</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2009</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Issued Date</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 5, 1986</td>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 1984</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ee. College of Justice and Safety, Department of Safety, Security & Emergency, Management, B.S. in Emergency Medical Care – program revision

ff. College of Justice and Safety, Department of Correctional & Juvenile Justice, Correctional and Juvenile Justice Studies, B.S. – program revision

gg. College of Justice and Safety, Department of Safety, Security & Emergency, Management, ASP in Paramedicine – program revision

hh. University Programs, Bachelor of Individualized Studies B.I.S. – program revision

ii. University Programs, General Studies B.A. – program revision


kk. College of Business & Technology, Department of Management, Marketing, & Administrative Communication, Corporate Communications and Technology B.B.A. – program suspension

ll. College of Arts & Sciences, Department of Geology and Geography, GIS Certificate - new certificate

mm. University Programs, Associate of General Studies A.G.S. - new program

Following presentation and discussion, Mr. Abney made a motion to approve. Ms. Pergrem second. Items a-mm were approved by voice vote. Details on the approved items recommended by the Council on Academic Affairs are included with the Official Minutes of the Board of Regents.

**Academic Policy Recommendations**

Dr. Vice presented for approval the following policy recommendations: Upper –Division- Hours Requirement for Baccalaureate Degree Policy; Graduate School, Graduate Faculty Criteria-Revision; and Policy 4.6.5 Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty. Following presentation and discussion, Mr. Fulkerson made a motion to approve. Dr. Frisbie second. The motion was approved by voice vote. The detail of the items presented and a copy of each approved policy are included with the Official Minutes of the Board of Regents.

**Scheduling of University Facilities and Outdoor Space Policy**

Ms. Mona Isaacs, Associate Vice President of Information Technology and Delivery Systems, presented for approval a proposed policy to establish a framework for the convenient and efficient use of campus facilities consistent with EKU’s mission. Following presentation and discussion, Mr. Combs made a motion to approve; Ms. Pergrem second. The motion was approved by voice vote. The detail of the item presented and a copy of the approved policy are included with the Official Minutes of the Board of Regents.
TO:  Dr. Doug Whitlock  
President

FROM:  Sherry Robinson  
Sherry Robinson, Special Assistant to the Provost

DATE:  April 15, 2009

RE:  Policy 4.6.5 Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

Executive Summary

Current policy governing the evaluation of non-tenured tenure-track faculty treats faculty in their first year at EKU the same as other probationary faculty: self-evaluations are due at the department level during the fall semester. This practice requires evaluators to base assessments of first-year faculty on less than one semester of experience at EKU, rendering this assessment of little value. Department chairs, noting the high level of stress and work for something of little value, submitted a revision to the existing policy that shifts evaluation of first-year faculty to the second semester and places the responsibility of formal evaluation on department chairs.

An impact statement was submitted in December 2008, after which a drafting team reviewed the policy and put it into the policy template. The policy was reviewed by Faculty Senate in February 2009 and recommended by that body in March. The Provost Council voted in March 2009 to support the policy revision but made a friendly amendment to change the policy name from “Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty” to “Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty”; the revised name more accurately reflects the intention of the policy. The revised policy was then posted on the University’s policy website for a 30-day public comment period. Nine comments were received: 3 people cited editorial corrections, 5 people expressed a desire to involve a departmental evaluation committee in addition to the Chair, and 1 person reiterated the difficulties in assessing first-year faculty based on limited data. The drafting team made some additional revisions based on the feedback.

Based on feedback from you, and with the support of the Provost Council, Policy 4.6.5 is now titled “Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty.” This policy is now submitted for your consideration and submittal to the Board of Regents for final approval. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Presidential Action:
☐ Recommend approval and submission to the Board of Regents for adoption
☐ Approve (no Board of Regents approval is required)
☐ Submit to President’s Cabinet for advisement
☐ Submit to ___________________________ for further review, drafting, or stakeholder feedback
☐ Not approved/ not recommended for submission to the Board of Regents
☐ Other action recommended

[Signature]  5/18/09  [Date]

Eastern Kentucky University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer and Educational Institution
University Policy Impact Statement

Date 12/02/2008

Check One: ☒ Revision of Existing Policy  ☐ New Policy

Policy Number (if known) 4.6.5
Policy Name Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty Members

Originator(s) Chairs' Association

Justification for Proposed Changes or for New Policy (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

(See attached sheet)

Consistency with EKU's Mission and Strategic Plan, Other Policies, and Related External Documents

Cite relevant official statements from EKU or external sources.

(See attached sheet)

Impact on the University
(1) Identify resources (human, financial, physical, operational, technological, other) needed to implement and maintain compliance; (2) Identify changes to EKU's culture and/or behaviors that may be involved.

The proposed policy has no anticipated budgetary impact and requires no significant change to the culture. The proposed policy would require a modification in behavior relating to the current process for conducting evaluations of non-tenured first-year faculty members.

List stakeholders who have been or will be consulted. Indicate action taken and the date it was taken. Attach additional page if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs Association</td>
<td>Policy originated</td>
<td>10/15/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Council</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
<td>Mar 4, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 2, Impact Statement for Policy 4.6.5

Justification for Proposed Changes or for New Policy

This proposed policy revision would permit (but not require) departments to design and conduct internal evaluations of first-year faculty as they deem appropriate on a timetable determined by the departments. The due dates for evaluations of first-year faculty members occur too early in the academic year for the faculty member to thoughtfully assess his/her progress and for the departmental committee to create a meaningful report supported by data relating to teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service. The revised process would permit the Chair to recommend a terminal contract in instances in which the faculty member's performance has been unacceptable, but would avoid the unnecessary labor of compiling a full file based on a semester’s worth of work, before evaluations are due and before the faculty member has had the opportunity to establish a record of scholarship or service at EKU.

Consistency with EKU's Mission and Strategic Plan, Other Policies, and Related External Documents

Mission: Eastern Kentucky University is a student-centered, comprehensive public university dedicated to high-quality instruction, scholarship, and service.

The proposed policy forwards the mission of the institution by creating a fair and meaningful evaluation process for first-year faculty members. The current policy evaluates new faculty members before they have had the opportunity to adapt to their new environment and to create a record of teaching, scholarship and service. This process serves neither the faculty member nor the students well. While a decision on reappointment must be made early in the Spring under AAUP guidelines and a negative decision would have to be justified with a substantive evaluation at that time. However, when the recommendation for reappointment is a positive one, there is greater benefit to all in delaying the creation of a report until the end of the Spring term, when the Chair will have significantly more data on which to base the assessment and more foundation for any constructive recommendations.
TO: Dr. Doug Whitlock
   President

FROM: Sherry Robinson, Special Assistant to the Provost

DATE: April 15, 2009

RE: Policy 4.6.5 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

Executive Summary

Current policy governing the evaluation of tenure-track faculty treats faculty in their first year at EKU the same as other probationary faculty: self-evaluations are due at the department level during the fall semester. This practice requires evaluators to base assessments of first-year faculty on less than one semester of experience at EKU, rendering this assessment of little value. Department chairs, noting the high level of stress and work for something of little value, submitted a revision to the existing policy that shifts evaluation of first-year faculty to the second semester and places the responsibility of formal evaluation on department chairs.

An impact statement was submitted in December 2008, after which a drafting team revised the policy and put it into the policy template. The policy was reviewed by Faculty Senate in February 2009 and recommended by that body in March. The Provost Council voted in March 2009 to support the policy revision but made a friendly amendment to change the policy name from “Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty” to “Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty”; the revised name more accurately reflects the intention of the policy. The revised policy was then posted on the University’s policy website for a 30-day public comment period. Nine comments were received: 3 people cited editorial corrections, 5 people expressed a desire to involve a departmental evaluation committee in addition to the Chair, and 1 person reiterated the difficulties in assessing first-year faculty based on limited data. The drafting team made some additional revisions based on the feedback.

Policy 4.6.5 is now submitted for your consideration and submittal to the Board of Regents for final approval. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Presidential Action:
☐ Recommend approval and submission to the Board of Regents for adoption
☐ Approve (no Board of Regents approval is required)
☐ Submit to President’s Cabinet for advisement
☐ Submit to ______________________ for further review, drafting, or stakeholder feedback
☐ Not approved/ not recommended for submission to the Board of Regents
☐ Other action recommended ________________________

_____________________________  ________________________
Signature                                   Date
A motion of support for the Stopping Out Policy was proposed and carried unanimously.

2. **Policy 4.6.5, Evaluation of Full-time Non-Tenured Faculty, 1st reading** – Dr. Sherry Robinson presented a draft of Policy 4.6.5, Evaluation of Full-time Non-Tenured Faculty, in the new policy template for the Council’s review. Revisions to the policy include the addition of Evaluating First-Year Full-time Faculty and minor editorial changes. The Chairs’ Association had identified an urgent concern with the current policy to be addressed immediately with unanimous representation of the proposed revisions. The draft policy was presented for review to the Faculty Senate on March 2, 2009. It will be posted on the Academic Affairs Policy website at [http://www.policies.eku.edu](http://www.policies.eku.edu) for a 30-day Policy Comments period. An EKU Today announcement will be sent out initially and again near the end of the 30-day review period notifying the campus community that the policy can be reviewed at the website.

A motion of support for the draft Policy 4.6.5, Evaluation of Full-time Non-Tenured Faculty was proposed. A friendly amendment was proposed to revise the policy name to Evaluation of Full-time Tenure Track Faculty. The proposed amendment carried unanimously and will be recommended to the policy drafting team.

A motion of support for draft Policy 4.6.5, Evaluation of Full-time Non-Tenured Faculty, carried unanimously.

V. **Good of the Order/Announcements**

1. **Maximum class enrollment** – A question was raised on how a determination is made for the maximum enrollment in a course. The unit and college make the decision for maximum enrollment of classes offered by the college.

2. **Academic Quality Group** – A meeting is scheduled for the Academic Quality Group on March 4, 2009, at 8:30 in the Tech Commons. All colleges have been invited to send representatives to this group’s meetings.

3. **Fireside Chat** – The Fireside Chat on March 5, 2009, at 8:30 a.m. will be hosted by President Whitlock in the Faculty Lounge of Keen Johnson.

4. **Huron Consulting Group** – The Huron Consulting Group will be on our campus the end of March conducting a space utilization survey.

5. **Education Trust Conference** – A PowerPoint document presented at the 19th Education Trust Conference promoting use of College Results Online as a graduation rate assessment tool was distributed for review.

VI. **Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.
It is anticipated that the Council on Postsecondary Education will approve a tuition ceiling of four percent for resident undergraduates for the state's comprehensive universities when it meets on March 6. EKU's Board of Regents will be reviewing proposed tuition rates for all categories of students at their next meeting on April 24. Hopefully, the net tuition increase will be sufficient to meet the unavoidable fixed cost increases in such things as utilities, benefits, insurance, etc.

There is also a possibility that some one-time monies may be received through the Federal stimulus initiatives to reduce the impact of a state budget shortfall in 2009-2010, and perhaps 2010-2011. Caution must be exercised, if these funds are realized, to make sure that recurring obligations are not unknowingly created. Unfortunately, the building infrastructure funds for education that were in the House version of the stimulus did not survive the House-Senate negotiations.

There are a number of funding opportunities available to higher education institutions through grants from Federal agencies in the stimulus. Dr. Pogatshnik has summary information on which agencies will be receiving grant proposals. Timeliness is of the essence in this regard.

While major gift income is down, there has been a substantial increase in the number of donors. In addition, Senator Whitlock has spent a lot of time in Washington working with congressional staff within Kentucky to build relationships that have already begun to pay dividends. Furthermore, the institution's visibility and standing has increased in Frankfort. The groundwork has also been laid for increased international relationships to provide greater opportunities for faculty and students.

Senator Whitlock shared the following highlights as a reminder that there are positive things happening at the institution:
1. The recognition of EKU's engagement with the community, region and beyond by the Carnegie Foundation.
2. The biofuels initiative has raised EKU's stature.
3. The Honors Program recently outshone many of the nation's "brand name" institutions with their Mock Trial.
4. Student Alumni Ambassadors have gained recognition as the very best.
5. This year's Chautauqua lecture series has an impressive group of speakers.

Senator Whitlock thanked everyone for helping to make EKU a special place.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Policy on Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty. Senator Piercey moved approval of the non-tenure evaluation policy, seconded by Senator May. Motion carried.
EVALUATION OF NON-TENURED FACULTY

Years One-Four

The following policies apply specifically to faculty in years one through four. Fifth year faculty will be evaluated by policies and procedures established by the colleges and approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

I. Procedures

The procedure for the evaluation of non-tenured faculty for years one through four is based on the principle that the department chair is ultimately responsible for the evaluation report. The chair must ensure that the report is a fair and accurate description of a faculty member's performance including both strengths and weaknesses.

A. Evaluation Committee

1. Each department shall select a committee (or committees) to advise the chair in the writing of the evaluation report for non-tenured faculty.

2. The method of selecting the committee shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time tenure track faculty of the department and approved by the dean. It is expected that the committee will be selected whenever possible from among the senior faculty in the department. Departments which do not have sufficient number of faculty may select faculty outside the department with the advice and consent of the dean.

3. The department chair shall chair the committee.

4. Once the committee is selected, the department chair shall announce the names of the committee members to the department. The chair shall report the names of the committee members to the dean.

B. Completion of the Evaluation Report

1. In the writing of the evaluation report, the chair should indicate the extent of the committee's involvement in the process. The committee should review the evaluation and may indicate areas of disagreement on the report form.

2. While the department chair is responsible for the evaluation report, he or she may delegate the writing of the report to the committee. Should the chair elect to delegate, the report should include the extent to which the chair agrees with the details of the report.
C. Information to be Used in Completing the Evaluation Report

1. Self-evaluation
2. Peer evaluation
3. Student evaluation data
4. Other systematic method(s) for evaluating teaching effectiveness (see Faculty Senate document, April 12, 1976)
5. Other information as available

D. Action Subsequent to Completion of Evaluation Report

1. A copy of the evaluation, including reasons for the recommendation, will be given to the faculty member immediately.

2. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by:
   a. Acceptance of the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the dean.
   b. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement must be submitted to the department chair within five (5) working days. The report and the appended material is forwarded to the dean.
   c. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the departmental promotion and tenure committee.
      i. Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the chair of the committee by the faculty member concerned within five working days of receiving the evaluation report from the department chair. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.
      ii. The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided in the statement of the faculty member. The committee will consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make their decision. The chair of the committee will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. The original evaluation, all information provided by the faculty member, and the report of the department promotion and tenure committee shall all be forwarded to the dean.

3. The dean will examine all of the material provided by the department.
   a. If the dean concurs with the recommendation of the department, the dean will submit the report, with his or her recommendations, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
b. If the dean does not concur with the recommendation of the department, a copy of the dean's recommendation and the report, including the reasons for that recommendation, will be given to the faculty member and the department chair. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by:

i. Acceptance of recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

ii. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement must be submitted to the dean within five (5) working days. The report and the appended material is forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

iii. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the college promotion and tenure committee.

   a. Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the dean by the department and/or faculty member concerned within five working days of receiving the evaluation report. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.

   b. The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided by the department and/or faculty member. The committee will consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make their decision. The dean will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. All information will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. After the Vice President and President have made their recommendations, the faculty member will then be notified by the department chair. The chair will provide a copy of the final report to the faculty member. The faculty member will sign the last page of the report indicating receipt of a copy of the report.

5. When written notification of non-reappointment or a terminal contract is necessary, the letter is to be prepared and signed by the President. The letter must be received not later than the applicable notification date specified in the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

6. Any further appeal must be based on procedural grounds and should be addressed in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
II. Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty Administrators

A. Chairs - All the same procedures will apply with the following differences:

1. The dean will take the chair's place on the department committee and be responsible for the report.

2. An evaluation of administrative performance will be included.

B. Deans - All the same procedures will apply with the following differences:

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research will be responsible for the report and will appoint an evaluation committee composed of chairs and one faculty member elected from each department of the college.

2. An evaluation of administrative performance will be included.

III. Schedule of Evaluation

A. It is expected that each department chair will provide each first year faculty member an information copy of the evaluation form (blank) and go over it in some detail prior to the time of evaluation. This will be done early in the first semester of employment.

B. All evaluations are to be completed according to the schedule established by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research. The schedule will permit notification of non-reappointment by the dates specified in the current Faculty/Staff Handbook.

IV. Appeal Procedure of Non-Tenured Faculty Administration

A. Chairs - The same appeal procedures will apply as for faculty, with the following differences:

1. The letter of appeal should be addressed to the dean of the college who will call a meeting of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2. If the individual is still not satisfied, he or she must write a letter to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research who will appoint a committee to consider the appeal.

3. Any further appeal should be directed to the President of the University.

B. Deans - The same procedures will apply as for faculty, with the following differences:

1. The letter of appeal should be addressed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research who will appoint a committee to consider the appeal.

2. Any further appeal should be directed to the President of the University.
Building is presently scheduled for such a renovation completion prior
to the fall semester of 1986. The Moore Building renovation will be
included in the major reconstruction project through the Bond Fund in
1986-87 fiscal year.

We provided for the continuation of intercollegiate swimming in 1986-87
on essentially the same basis as in 1985-86. Beyond 1986-87 the athletic
scholarships for men's and women's swimming will be totally dependent
on the level of private support and other fund raising activities
generated by the swimming program, under the guidance of the University's
development staff. The University will continue to pay the coaches
salaries, the operating expenses and the team travel.

Actually the recommendation on swimming was part of a two page statement
relating to the intercollegiate athletics program which the Board
approved. In this two page statement (which I'll also submit with my
report) the Board endorsed the concept of the comprehensive marketing/
fund raising plan developed to enhance the promotion and revenue
production of men's and women's intercollegiate athletics. (See attachment VI)

The salary roster will be on reserve at the library soon.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Procedure for the Evaluation of Non-tenured Faculty (Report from the Ad Hoc
   Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities).

   In the April 7 Senate meeting a substitute motion was passed to adopt the
document on the Evaluation of Non-tenured Faculty Identified as attachment IV
to the March 3, 1986, minutes of the Faculty Senate and also as attachment IV
to the April 7, 1986, minutes of the Faculty Senate in lieu of the main
motion made by Senator Thompson and seconded by Senator Gray to approve the
report, as amended, submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rights and
Responsibilities. Following passage of the above motion during the April 7
Senate meeting, Senator Costello, seconded by Senator Ellis, moved to table
the substitute motion now on the floor as the main motion. The motion to
table passed.

   In today's meeting (May 5, 1986) Chair Heberle ruled that the motion to
table made at the April 7 meeting was clearly intended as a postponement of
discussion rather than as a table, and that he would treat it as such.
Therefore, the motion on the floor for consideration is the motion to sub-
stitute the old document (attachment IV to March 3 and April 7 minutes) for
the original main motion made by Senator Thompson, seconded by Senator Gray,
and mentioned in the above paragraph.

   Senator LeVan, seconded by Senator Costello, moved to amend the motion by
replacing the language of item I. D. page 2 of Evaluation of Non-Tenured
Faculty, Years One - Four with the following language:

   D. Action Subsequent to Completion of Evaluation Report.

       1. A copy of the evaluation, including reasons for the
          recommendation, will be given to the faculty member
          immediately.
2. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by:
   
a. Acceptance of the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the dean.

b. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement must be submitted to the department chair within five (5) working days. The report and the appended material is forwarded to the dean.

c. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the departmental promotion and tenure committee.
   
i. Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the chair of the committee by the faculty member concerned within five working days of receiving the evaluation report from the department chair. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.

ii. The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided in the statement of the faculty member. The committee will consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make their decision. The chair of the committee will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. The original evaluation, all information provided by the faculty member, and the report of the department promotion and tenure committee shall all be forwarded to the dean.

3. The dean will examine all of the material provided by the department.
   
a. If the dean concurs with the recommendation of the department, the dean will submit the report, with his or her recommendations, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

b. If the dean does not concur with the recommendation of the department, a copy of the dean's recommendation and the report, including the reasons for that recommendation, will be given to the faculty member and the department chair. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by:
   
i. Acceptance of recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

ii. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement must be submitted to the dean within
five (5) working days. The report and the appended material is forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

iii. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the college promotion and tenure committee.
   a. Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the dean by the department and/or faculty member concerned within five working days of receiving the evaluation report. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.
   b. The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided by the department and/or faculty member. The committee will consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make their decision. The dean will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. All information will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. After the Vice President and President have made their recommendations, the faculty member will then be notified by the department chair. The chair will provide a copy of the final report to the faculty member. The faculty member will sign the last page of the report indicating receipt of a copy of the report.

5. When written notification of non-reappointment or a terminal contract is necessary, the letter is to be prepared and signed by the President. The letter must be received not later than the applicable notification date specified in the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

6. Any further appeal must be based on procedural grounds and should be addressed in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Senators Costello and Sigelman spoke in favor of the motion. The question was called and the motion to amend passed.

Next, Senator LeVan moved to delete sections IV and V of the document heretofore identified as attachment IV, the old document, or as Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty, Years One-Four. Senator Hale seconded the motion. Senator Rowlett, seconded by Senator Hale, then moved to separate sections IV and V for purposes of consideration and voting. The vote was taken on the question of deleting section IV and the motion to delete passed. The vote was taken on the question of deleting section V and the motion to delete failed.

The vote was called for on the motion to approve the Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty, Years One-Four, as amended. The motion passed. The policy as amended is attached to these minutes as attachment VII.
By general agreement of the Senate, an editorial change was made in the first sentence of II.C.3. so that the sentence now reads, "If the chair is reappointed after the 5th year, he/she shall be re-evaluated every four years."

The vote on the main motion as amended was taken and the motion passed. The policy, as amended, is attachment VIII to these minutes.

REPORT FROM THE COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Senator Rowlett, seconded by Senator Gale, moved that the name "Department of Medical Services Technology" for the combined Emergency Medical Care and Medical Assisting Departments, effective July 1, 1986, be approved. The motion passed.

Next, Senator Rowlett, seconded by Senator Bromley, moved that the following proposal concerning faculty workload be approved:

Faculty workload consists of three major areas of responsibility: teaching, service, and research.

The standard teaching load of full-time faculty members with the rank of assistant professor or above is twelve semester hours. Size and type of class, not simply number of credit hours, may be considered in establishing an equitable teaching load. Included in the teaching responsibility are such activities as class preparation, maintaining reasonable office hours, grading, and conference with students.

While the teaching responsibility alone takes the bulk of the available time for faculty, they also have an obligation to carry a fair share of the service responsibility to the university (normally through committee service and student advising), to the community (related to one's professional expertise), and to the profession (through participation in appropriate professional organizations).

In addition, faculty members have an obligation to engage in scholarly activity beyond that required for preparation of classes. Scholarly activity is defined as research, artistic performance, or creative or technical achievement. Normally, the results of such activity would be presented in the form of a paper read to a professional organization, a book or article published by an appropriate press or scholarly journal, or a performance or an exhibit.

Because of the demands of the three parts of the faculty workload, it is desirable to reduce the teaching load for a faculty member carrying an exceptional service load (e.g., chair of a major committee, administrative duties, a heavy advising load, or comparable responsibilities). Faculty members who regularly engage in significant scholarly activity (including grant proposals) or who teach at the graduate level may also be considered for a reduced teaching load. All reduced teaching loads, including those of departmental chairs, must be justified and approved through administrative channels.

It is understood that faculty responsibilities are not confined to the five-day week, to the operating hours of the university administrative offices, or to the Richmond campus.
TO: Hanly Funderburk, President
FROM: Kenneth D. Turnell, Secretary
Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Item Approved by the Faculty Senate
DATE: May 15, 1986

Attached is a copy of the Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty, Years One-Four as approved by the Faculty Senate on May 5, 1986.
EVALUATION OF NON-TENURED FACULTY
Years One-Four

The following policies apply specifically to faculty in years one through four. Fifth year faculty will be evaluated by policies and procedures established by the colleges and approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

I. Procedures

The procedure for the evaluation of non-tenured faculty for years one through four is based on the principle that the department chair is ultimately responsible for the evaluation report. The chair must ensure that the report is a fair and accurate description of a faculty member's performance including both strengths and weaknesses.

A. Evaluation Committee

1. Each department shall select a committee (or committees) to advise the chair in the writing of the evaluation report for non-tenured faculty.

2. The method of selecting the committee shall be approved by a majority vote of the full-time tenure track faculty of the department and approved by the dean. It is expected that the committee will be selected whenever possible from among the senior faculty in the department. Departments which do not have sufficient number of faculty may select faculty outside the department with the advice and consent of the dean.

3. The department chair shall chair the committee.

4. Once the committee is selected, the department chair shall announce the names of the committee members to the department. The chair shall report the names of the committee members to the dean.

B. Completion of the Evaluation Report

1. In the writing of the evaluation report, the chair should indicate the extent of the committee's involvement in the process. The committee should review the evaluation and may indicate areas of disagreement on the report form.

2. While the department chair is responsible for the evaluation report, he or she may delegate the writing of the report to the committee. Should the chair elect to delegate, the report should include the extent to which the chair agrees with the details of the report.
C. Information to be Used in Completing the Evaluation Report

1. Self-evaluation
2. Peer evaluation
3. Student evaluation data
4. Other systematic method(s) for evaluating teaching effectiveness
   (see Faculty Senate document, April 12, 1978)
5. Other information as available

D. Action Subsequent to Completion of Evaluation Report

1. A copy of the evaluation, including reasons for the recommendation, will be given to the faculty member immediately.

2. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by:
   a. Acceptance of the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the dean.
   b. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement must be submitted to the department chair within five (5) working days. The report and the appended material is forwarded to the dean.
   c. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the departmental promotion and tenure committee.
      i. Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the chair of the committee by the faculty member concerned within five working days of receiving the evaluation report from the department chair. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.
      ii. The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided in the statement of the faculty member. The committee will consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make their decision. The chair of the committee will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. The original evaluation, all information provided by the faculty member, and the report of the department promotion and tenure committee shall all be forwarded to the dean.

3. The dean will examine all of the material provided by the department.
   a. If the dean concurs with the recommendation of the department, the dean will submit the report, with his or her recommendations, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
b. If the dean does not concur with the recommendation of the department, a copy of the dean's recommendation and the report, including the reasons for that recommendation, will be given to the faculty member and the department chair. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by:

i. Acceptance of recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

ii. Filing a statement, including any documentation desired, to be appended to the document. This statement must be submitted to the dean within five (5) working days. The report and the appended material is forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

iii. Requesting reconsideration of the report by the college promotion and tenure committee.

   a. Requests for reconsideration shall be submitted to the dean by the department and/or faculty member concerned within five working days of receiving the evaluation report. Requests for reconsideration shall detail grounds for reconsideration and shall include relevant evidence.

   b. The committee shall reconsider the evaluation and recommendation in light of the information provided by the department and/or faculty member. The committee will consider any new information provided, meet with the faculty member and department chair, and make their decision. The dean will inform the faculty member of the committee decision. All information will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. After the Vice President and President have made their recommendations, the faculty member will then be notified by the department chair. The chair will provide a copy of the final report to the faculty member. The faculty member will sign the last page of the report indicating receipt of a copy of the report.

5. When written notification of non-reappointment or a terminal contract is necessary, the letter is to be prepared and signed by the President. The letter must be received not later than the applicable notification date specified in the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

6. Any further appeal must be based on procedural grounds and should be addressed in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
II. Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty Administrators

A. Chairs - All the same procedures will apply with the following differences:

1. The dean will take the chair's place on the department committee and be responsible for the report.

2. An evaluation of administrative performance will be included.

B. Deans - All the same procedures will apply with the following differences:

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research will be responsible for the report and will appoint an evaluation committee composed of chairs and one faculty member elected from each department of the college.

2. An evaluation of administrative performance will be included.

III. Schedule of Evaluation

A. It is expected that each department chair will provide each first year faculty member an information copy of the evaluation form (blank) and go over it in some detail prior to the time of evaluation. This will be done early in the first semester of employment.

B. All evaluations are to be completed according to the schedule established by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research. The schedule will permit notification of non-reappointment by the dates specified in the current Faculty/Staff Handbook.

IV. Appeal Procedure of Non-Tenured Faculty Administration

A. Chairs - The same appeal procedures will apply as for faculty, with the following differences:

1. The letter of appeal should be addressed to the dean of the college who will call a meeting of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2. If the individual is still not satisfied, he or she must write a letter to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research who will appoint a committee to consider the appeal.

3. Any further appeal should be directed to the President of the University.

B. Deans - The same procedures will apply as for faculty, with the following differences:

1. The letter of appeal should be addressed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research who will appoint a committee to consider the appeal.

2. Any further appeal should be directed to the President of the University.