

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES

Policy: University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Division of Academic Affairs
Subject: Criteria and Procedures for UAMS Annual Faculty Reviews
Number: 2.3.3

Date Approved (Council of Deans, Provost): March 27, 2019

Date Effective: March 27, 2019

Last Review/Revision: NA: New Policy

Next Review/Revision: March 27, 2021

PURPOSE

This policy provides the criteria and procedures that will be followed within the annual reviews of UAMS faculty members.

SCOPE

This policy applies to all UAMS faculty members and includes guidance about annual reviews for faculty members who hold the rank of instructor as well as for tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and faculty appointed on non-tenure pathways.

DEFINITIONS

This policy utilizes definitions specified in UA Board Policies 405.1. In addition, the UAMS definitions of overall satisfactory performance and overall unsatisfactory performance are specified in section 1.B.ix of this document.

POLICY

1. Annual Reviews

An annual review of the work and status of each faculty member shall be made on the basis of assigned duties and according to the criteria and procedures required herein. Each year the Provost (Chief Academic Officer), in conjunction with the Deans, shall a) require of each chairperson an assessment of the performance of all faculty members in the academic unit, including, if applicable, identification of outstanding contributions of each faculty member, review of the previous year's goals, identification of all faculty development needs and of all problems in the performance of each faculty member, goal-setting with each faculty member for the following year; and b) in consultation with the Chancellor,

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3

take steps designed to insure compliance with all criteria and procedures for annual reviews.

A. Instructors

The rank of instructor is awarded to individuals who serve a broad range of duties at UAMS. Instructors within some units of UAMS are not eligible for tenure track appointments. Department chairs are responsible for determining whether or not individual instructors will receive annual faculty reviews according to these criteria and procedures or via alternative procedures consistent with their training programs (e.g., Chief Residents within the College of Medicine’s clinical departments). Typically, instructors who are expected to pursue promotion at UAMS shall receive annual reviews in accordance with these criteria and procedures.

B. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Provided a faculty member is in substantial compliance with applicable University policies and legal requirements, the annual review of each faculty member shall provide the primary basis for the chairperson’s recommendations relating to salary, promotion, granting of tenure, successive appointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal. Furthermore, the review is to provide guidance and assistance to all faculty in their professional development and academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research and scholarly activity, clinical duties (when applicable), and service to the faculty member’s unit, to UAMS as a whole, to the community (when applicable), and/or to the profession.

All procedures for annual reviews shall include provision for the following:

- i. Informing newly appointed faculty members about the annual review process: Within a reasonable time after the beginning of the first appointment of each faculty member, typically within 90 days, written notification (including electronic notification) shall be made to the faculty member of the criteria, procedures and instruments in use for assessing the faculty member’s performance. The instruments shall be maintained by each college and shall be available on the college’s academic website and linked to the UAMS Faculty website: <https://faculty.uams.edu/general-resources/>
- ii. Informing all faculty members about annual duties and annual reviews: Within a reasonable time shortly before or after the beginning of each academic year, each faculty member shall be informed of any changes in their duty assignments compared to the previous year, and shall be informed of any changes in the criteria, procedure, time schedule and instruments that shall be used in the annual review process.¹
- iii. Faculty members’ opportunities to submit information about their performance in the preceding academic year: Instruments developed in each unit shall provide faculty

¹ If duty assignments must change within a semester, then affected faculty members shall be informed of all of this information shortly after the beginning of each semester.

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3

members the means by which they may submit any relevant material documenting their professional performance to be considered in the annual review. As noted in section 1.B.i of this document, the instruments will be maintained on each unit's web site and by electronic linkage, on the UAMS Faculty web site.

- iv. Peer evaluation of at least some aspect(s) of each faculty member's duties performed during the academic year under review shall be submitted within the annual review instrument(s). It is the department chair's responsibility to indicate to the respective dean and the Provost that each faculty member's annual review includes at least one element of peer-reviewed performance. The procedure for this attestation is described in section 1.D.ii of this document.

Evidence of peer review may include, and shall not be limited to:

- a. Evidence of the peer-assessment of one or more episodes of the faculty member's teaching, available through the Teaching Observation by Peers Program (TOPS), provided through the UAMS Office of Educational Development
 - b. Evidence of the peer-review process through the submission of scholarly works for publication in peer-reviewed professional journals and other professional media (e.g. guidelines, quality improvement processes, etc.).
 - c. Evidence of the grant application scoring process by a national study section
 - d. Evidence by clinicians who hold credentials to practice within a Joint Commission-accredited hospital of successful completion of Ongoing Professional Performance Evaluation (OPPE)
 - e. Evidence of any element of a faculty member's work that is reviewed and assessed by a group of faculty peers convened for this purpose by the department chair
 - f. Evidence of a "360 degree" evaluation of a faculty member's work
- v. Student evaluations of teaching, made fully available to the faculty member and those conducting the review
 - vi. A meeting between the chairperson and the faculty member: Prior to the chairperson's completion of the annual evaluation (including any recommendations based on the evaluation) in any year: a) a meeting shall occur between the chairperson and the faculty member to discuss all issues related to the review; b) the faculty member shall

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3

be provided with a copy of the chairperson's intended evaluation and recommendation(s), and c) a reasonable opportunity for the faculty member to submit a written response to the annual evaluation (including any recommendations), which will be forwarded to the dean (or appropriate next level of review in the case of the Division of Academic Affairs) ^{2,3}

- vii. Record retention requirements: As long as a faculty member is employed by UAMS and for at least three years thereafter – maintenance of annual review forms, recommendations, associated narratives, and all other relevant materials used in or resulting from the annual reviews of each faculty member shall be maintained by the department chair.
- viii. Availability to each faculty member of all writings used in or resulting from the annual review of that faculty member
- ix. Overall assessment of performance: In order to maintain a high quality and productive environment necessary to support the excellent provision of education, research endeavors, and clinical care, annual review procedures adopted at UAMS shall provide prompt, meaningful, and effective means of addressing unsatisfactory faculty performance.

Satisfactory performance: It is the department chair's responsibility to determine and specify reasonable performance expectations for the department's faculty in each domain of faculty work, e.g., teaching, research and scholarly work, clinical service (when applicable), and service to the department, college, University, community (when applicable) and/or profession. The chair may seek input from senior faculty members in the specification of reasonable performance expectations. Within the annual review, in alignment with each unit's requirements for promotion, each faculty member will receive an assessment, at a minimum, of either 1) having met performance expectations, or 2) having failed to meet performance expectations. Written evidence must be available to substantiate the chair's assessments.

Professional Conduct: Professional conduct is a necessary behavioral attribute that must be demonstrated by faculty members in order to support effective educational,

² In large departments that include administrative divisions of the faculty, it is acceptable for the department chair to delegate the duties of conducting the annual reviews of each of the division's faculty members to the respective division or section chief. The division or section chiefs and department chair share the responsibility of assuring that the department chair participates in the final review of all the department's faculty members and concurs with the written review and any recommendations provided to each faculty member.

³ Within each UAMS Regional Program (RP) Center wherein faculty members are appointed, it is acceptable for the department chair to delegate the duties of conducting the annual reviews of each faculty member to the Residency Program Director (RPD). After completing the annual review process, locally, the RPD will submit annual review documentation to the Chief Medical Office of RP for review. Subsequent to the CMO of RP's review, the documentation will be forwarded to the appropriate Department Chair on the UAMS Little Rock campus.

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3

research and clinical care environments. Within annual reviews, the department chair shall assess whether each faculty member has demonstrated professional conduct, consistent with the UAMS Core Values: integrity, respect, diversity and health equity, teamwork, creativity, excellence and safety. The department chair will specify that a faculty member has either 1) demonstrated professional conduct consistent with the UAMS Core Values, or 2) has failed to demonstrate sufficient professional conduct consistent with the UAMS Core Values. Written evidence must be available to substantiate the chair's assessment of a faculty member's having failed to demonstrate, sufficiently, behavior consistent with UAMS Core Values. Annual review assessment instruments will include a "comments" section that chairs may use to note areas of excellence and areas for improvement.

Pursuant to UA Board Policy 405.1 (footnote 2, page 2), UAMS adopts the following procedural definitions of **overall satisfactory performance** and **overall unsatisfactory performance**.

Overall satisfactory or overall unsatisfactory performance assessment: Within annual reviews, the department chair will provide an overall assessment that includes 1) consideration of work performance within each domain of the faculty member's duties, e.g., teaching, research and scholarly work, clinical service (when applicable), and service to the department, college, University, community (when applicable) and/or profession; and 2) the faculty member's manifestation of appropriate professional conduct. It is the responsibility of the department chair to weigh both of these aspects of a faculty member's participation in the UAMS academic community. The chair may seek input from other senior faculty in making this assessment.

Effective July 1, 2019, any tenure-track or tenured faculty member who receives an **overall** unsatisfactory performance assessment shall be placed on a remediation plan. The remediation plan shall be developed by the faculty member's academic unit in consultation with the faculty member and shall include remedial measures designed to address the overall performance deficiencies, with the expectation that carrying out the plan will lead to an **overall** satisfactory performance assessment. If, in the next annual review following an **overall** unsatisfactory performance assessment, the faculty member fails to attain either an **overall** satisfactory performance assessment or to demonstrate meaningful progress in remediating the overall performance deficiencies, the faculty member **may** be issued a notice of dismissal on twelve months' notice as provided for within Section IV.C of UA Board Policy 405.1.

C. Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty who are not tenured or not in tenure-track positions shall be evaluated by procedures adopted by the dean of each college within UAMS, and by the Provost for the faculty appointed within the Division of UAMS Academic Affairs. Such procedures shall provide guidance and assistance to these faculty in their professional development and academic responsibilities. To the extent applicable and as fully as practicable, the criteria referenced in sections 1.B. and 1.D of this document (especially

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3

with regard to peer and student evaluations) should be utilized in developing such procedures. If procedures differ from those specified in sections 1.B. and 1.D. of this document, they must be submitted to the Provost for approval.

D. Procedures for Annual Faculty Reviews

The deans of the UAMS Colleges of Health Professions, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Public Health shall be responsible for assuring the development of instruments used in annual faculty reviews. The Provost shall be responsible for assuring the development of instruments used in the annual reviews of faculty appointed within UAMS Academic Affairs. In all the instruments used by each department chair, at a minimum, the following assessments shall be documented:

- i. For each domain of a faculty member’s work, the chair will indicate whether the faculty member has met expectation or has failed to meet expectation. Examples of how the chair’s assessments can be documented include:

Work performance in each domain of the faculty member’s time and effort distribution:

	Meets Expectations	Failed to Meet Expectations	N/A	If failed to meet expectations – summarize evidence of having failed to meet expectations
Teaching and Mentoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Research and Scholarly Activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Clinical Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Leadership and Administrative Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comments:				

Professional Conduct (choose one)

Demonstrated professional conduct consistent with UAMS Core Values	<input type="checkbox"/>
Failed to demonstrate professional conduct consistent with UAMS Core Values	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3

Overall Performance Assessment (choose one):

Overall Satisfactory Performance	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Unsatisfactory Performance	<input type="checkbox"/>

- ii. The annual review instruments used by all academic units of UAMS will contain the following items to facilitate documentation, by department chairs, that the annual review contains peer-review of at least some aspect(s) of the individual faculty member’s performance within the year under assessment:

Has the requirement for peer-review of at least an element of this faculty member’s work this past year been satisfied	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
If “yes”, briefly specify how this was accomplished:		

- iii. Appeal process:

- 1) Should a department chair determine that a faculty member’s performance has been overall unsatisfactory, prior to sharing the assessment with the faculty member, the chair shall convene a group of faculty members, of the chair’s choosing, from within and/or from outside the department, to provide peer-review of the performance evidence and share their opinions and recommendations about the overall assessment that should be provided to the faculty member. Information about this review should be documented with the understanding that it will be shared with the faculty member and the dean.
- 2) A faculty member whose performance has been evaluated as overall unsatisfactory may appeal the chair’s judgment and decision to the dean. Such an appeal shall be requested of the dean, in writing, within 10 business days of the faculty member’s receipt of the chair’s assessment.

The dean (or his/her designee) has the responsibility to convene the respective college’s Promotion and Tenure Committee to serve as the appeals committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review the evidence on which the chair’s assessment was based and share their findings with the dean within 60 days of the dean’s receipt of the request from the faculty member. Should the chair be a member of the college’s Promotion and Tenure Committee, s/he shall not serve on the Committee within the appeals process. Both the chair and the faculty member shall be given the opportunity to provide additional written information to the appeals committee. This group may inquire about the faculty member’s work performance of the faculty member, the chair, and other members of the UAMS community, as needed, in order to conduct its work. The documented findings of the group will be shared with the faculty member, the chair, and the dean. The dean shall consider the faculty member’s self-assessment (presented within the annual

UAMS Academic Affairs Policy – 2.3.3

review), any additional information provided by the faculty member, the chair's assessment documentation, and the findings of the appeals committee in determining the faculty member's overall performance assessment. The decision of the dean is final and shall be shared with the faculty member and the department chair within 10 business days of the dean's having received the appeals committee's recommendations.

- iv. Remediation Plan: Should a faculty member receive an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, whether determined by the chair or by the dean after an appeal of the chair's initial assessment, it is the chair's responsibility to develop and document the plan with members of the academic unit in consultation with the faculty member. The plan shall include four components and be approved by the dean:
 - a. Specification of the nature of the unsatisfactory performance (e.g., name the problems and performance deficiencies, whether in domains of the faculty member's work, or professional conduct, or both)
 - b. Specification of the expected improvement(s) within a year's time, including what shall be considered meaningful progress toward remediating the deficiencies. At a minimum, the department chair will assure that a faculty member who is working on a remediation plan is provided with at least quarterly feedback about their progress toward remediating the problems.
 - c. Identification of sources of help and support for the faculty member, and if fees or costs are associated, specify who shall pay the costs.
 - d. Specification of the range of consequences for failure to rectify the deficiencies, including the pertinent language in UA Policy 405.1, Section V.A.9.

REFERENCES

UA Board Policy 405.1 Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, Non-Reappointment and Dismissal of Faculty