

Form 9: Annual Review Improvement Template Supporting Narrative

A review of the improvement plans/written plans that accompany the Annual Performance and Planning Review (APPR) of faculty members for whom they are required reveals disparities in items that are included in the plans. In isolated instances, the Performance Improvement Plan used for staff evaluations has been used as a template for a faculty member's evaluation.

The purpose of the written Annual Review Improvement Plan, hereafter referred to as the Improvement Plan, is to assist the faculty member in meeting departmental expectations.

- The Improvement Plan is required for all tenured or tenure track faculty members who receive a "Needs Improvement" or "Does Not Meet Expectations" rating on the APPR (see Section 4.16.3, 2015 UTHSC Faculty Handbook).
- An Improvement Plan may be recommended, or an appointment may be non-renewed, for non-tenure track faculty members who receive a "Needs Improvement" or "Does Not Meet Expectations" rating on the APPR (see Section 5.3.4, 2015 UTHSC Faculty Handbook).

See, also, the guidance in the UT System Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (relevant sections from the UTHSC Faculty Handbook and the UT System Policy document is appended.

The **Annual Review Improvement Template (Form 9)** was developed to assist faculty members and department chairs in constructing, evaluating, and monitoring the Improvement Plan. Questions on the development of an Improvement Plan may be directed to college faculty affairs leadership or to Cindy Russell, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs at crussell@uthsc.edu or 901-448-6158.

Important Guiding Documents

UT System Policies Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure
<http://www.tennessee.edu/system/academicaffairs/docs/BdTenurePolicy.pdf>

Within 30 days of the annual review, any faculty member rated Needs Improvement for Rank or Unsatisfactory for Rank must collaborate with the Head on an Annual Review Improvement Plan to be reviewed by the Head and recommended by him/her to the Dean for review and approval/denial. The next year's annual review must include a progress report that clearly describes improvements in any area(s) noted as Needs Improvement for Rank or Unsatisfactory for Rank. (from p.9)

2015 UTHSC Faculty Handbook

4.16.3 Annual Performance and Planning Review

In response to a negative rating (i.e., "Needs Improvement for Rank" or "Unsatisfactory for Rank"), the Chair and the tenured faculty member must develop a written plan whereby the faculty member can meet the departmental expectations; this plan must

Form 9: Annual Review Improvement Template
Supporting Narrative

be contained in the summary of the Annual Performance and Planning Review. A faculty member whose performance is rated as “Needs Improvement for Rank” or “Unsatisfactory for Rank” shall be **ineligible** for merit pay or performance based salary adjustment, and must provide to the Chair a written Interim Progress Report of remedial steps taken on his or her performance in area(s) noted as “Unsatisfactory for Rank,” with copies forwarded to the Dean. The Dean must notify the UTHSC Chief Academic Officer, of all faculty members whose performance is rated as “Unsatisfactory for Rank.”

5.3.4 Performance Rated “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory”

Any nontenure track faculty member whose performance is rated “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory for Rank” shall not be eligible for merit pay or for a performance based salary supplement. In such cases, the Chair or supervisor may recommend an improvement plan to correct areas of poor performance. Alternatively, the Chair or supervisor may recommend non-renewal of the appointment for the upcoming year (or other appointment period).

A faculty member on an improvement plan must provide to the Chair or supervisor a written interim progress report of remedial steps taken with copies forwarded to the Dean. Such reports must be submitted by the midpoint of the upcoming appointment period. If, in the opinion of the Chair or relevant supervisor, sufficient progress towards remediation has not been made, he/she may recommend that the appointment be terminated for adequate cause (as defined in Section 8.2) under the procedure described in Section 5.5 below.