

# Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Guidelines

## The University of Texas at San Antonio

This set of guidelines provides information for faculty undergoing a Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (CPE). Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty is required by [Texas Education Code Section 51.942](#), [Regents' Rule 31102](#) and [HOP 2.22](#), all of which establish that the overriding purpose for faculty evaluation is to support tenure and promote faculty development.” These guidelines also provide information for those faculty serving on the Department and College CPE Review Committees (D-CPER and C-CPER, respectively), Department Chair/School Directors, and deans involved in the review process. These guidelines are reviewed annually and updated as needed by Academic Affairs.

The CPE process is a post-tenure review process employed by the university to uphold high standards and expectations for its faculty. UTSA seeks to provide, promote, and sustain a landscape that is conducive to sharing, extending, and critically examining knowledge and values, and to furthering intellectual discourse as also outlined in the [Faculty Code of Ethics](#). It is incumbent upon all who are involved in the review process to read all applicable materials, deliberate the strengths and weaknesses of each faculty member’s performance in good faith with objectivity, and to observe confidentiality concerning the views of others, as revealed during review discussions. A respectful, thorough, and objective review of faculty accomplishments depends upon the conscientious efforts of all participants in the review process. All written materials generated through the review process are available for the inspection of faculty candidates. Questions concerning the university’s procedures for CPE review may be directed to Academic Affairs.

These guidelines are divided into several sections with the following contents:

- Overview of Process**— a brief description of the timeline for review and the responsibilities of each party at each stage of the process.
- Preparation of the Review Packet**— a listing of essential and optional elements to include in the review packet prepared by tenured faculty.
- Review Process**— an outline of the responsibilities of the CPE review committees, Department Chair/School Director, and dean in carrying out the review.
- Checklist**— a summary of required and optional materials to be submitted for the purposes of CPE review.

### *Schedule for CPE Review*

Each tenured faculty member, including those appointed to part-time administrative positions (e.g. chair or associate dean) will undergo a CPE review in the sixth year following the previous comprehensive review, whether that review be the awarding of tenure, the promotion to full professor, or the previous CPE review.

In addition, if a faculty member is scheduled for a CPE review and requests to be reviewed for promotion to full professor, the CPE review is placed on hold until the outcome of the promotion to full professor has been decided. If the promotion to full professor is successful, the CPE will be rescheduled to the next sixth-year period. If the promotion to full professor is not awarded, the Department Chair/School Director and dean will then evaluate the promotion and tenure DFRAC recommendation and provide a succinct evaluation that will serve as the CPE review.

Academic Affairs keeps the official calendar of CPE reviews and notifies the deans each spring of those faculty who are due to undergo review in the following academic year.

**Overview of Process**

The CPE review process is summarized in the table below:

<i>When</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
February - March	Academic Affairs	Notify deans which tenured faculty members are due to undergo a CPE review in the next spring semester.
March	Academic Affairs	Notify tenured faculty that a CPE review will take place in the next spring semester.
Summer - Fall	Tenured Faculty under review	Assemble review packet and upload documents to the official Faculty Review folder no later than December 1st or the first workday thereafter.

August-September	Department	Elects the D-CPER committee.
	Department Chair/School Director	Report membership of the D-CPER committee to dean no later than Sept. 1 <sup>st</sup> . The Dean's office will provide the committee membership to Academic Affairs.
	Tenured Faculty under review	Optional: candidate may request to meet with the D-CPER committee request should be made no later than September 25 <sup>th</sup> .
January - February	D-CPER committee	Evaluate the review packet and provide evaluation recommendations for each individual category, as well as the overall rating.  Submit report to Department Chair/School Director/official Faculty Review folder (deadline set by each college).
February-March	Department Chair/School Director	Review all documentary materials and the report from the D-CPER committee.  Compose Chair's CPE evaluation report.  Upload D-CPER memo and Department Chair/School Director memo to the official Faculty Review folder;  Share copies of D-CPER memo and Department Chair/School Director memo with the faculty member by March 15 <sup>th</sup> .
January- March	D-CPER committee, Chair, Dean	May request additional documentation from faculty member, if needed.
March-April	Dean	Review all documentary materials and reports from D-CPER committee and from the Department Chair/School Director;  Determine final evaluation of faculty performance;

		<p>If performance evaluation is “unsatisfactory” in any area of evaluation, may appoint a C-CPER committee review committee.*</p> <p>Upload dean’s memo to the official Faculty Review folder;</p> <p>Forward files to Academic Affairs by April 5<sup>th</sup>.</p>
May 1 <sup>st</sup>	Academic Affairs	Prepare final notification letter regarding outcome of CPE to faculty with a copy to the dean and Department Chair/School Director.
May	Faculty member	Provides additional information to college level C-CPER committee.*
May	C-CPER committee	Evaluate review materials and provide a written report of analysis to dean by May 31 <sup>st</sup> .*
	Dean	Submit evaluation reports to provost with recommendations for follow-up actions by June 15 <sup>th</sup> .*
June	Provost	Review and approve any faculty development plans recommended by dean as the result of an unsatisfactory CPE review.*
	Dean	Communicate faculty development plans to faculty member.*

\*These steps are necessary only in the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation. The process for satisfactory evaluations ends in April with notification sent to Academic Affairs.

The deadlines indicated in this chart are intended to be general guidelines. Any significant deviation from these deadlines (for example, by two weeks or more) must be approved by the dean upon the written request of the Department Chair/School Director, with notification to Academic Affairs.

## **Preparation of the Review Packet**

The review packet contains the materials that form the basis for the evaluation at all levels of review. It is important that tenured faculty members undergoing a CPE make every effort to ensure that the material contained in the packet is complete, accurate, and professionally presented. The preferred submission format for materials is pdf (however; please do not lock/restrict/password protect any documents).

The contents of the review packet should include the following elements:

1. a professional curriculum vitae
2. a summary statement of professional accomplishments during the evaluation period and COVID-19 Impact Checklist. In addition to the summary statement, faculty may include a brief summary of future professional plans during the subsequent six (6) years
3. a summary of student course evaluation survey results (use template)
4. copy(s) of peer observer report(s) and faculty member report(s). Please refer to the Peer Observation Guidelines for more information
5. copies of the annual reports, including chair and dean written annual evaluations during the evaluation period
6. optional supplementary materials
7. evaluations and analyses reported by the D-CPER committee, Department Chair/School Director, and dean

The professional vitae should serve as a simple listing of professional activities, while each of the other components provides more in-depth information about those activities. The suggested contents of each of these elements should be consistent with those outlined in the Promotion and Tenure guidelines. The faculty member undergoing CPE review is responsible for preparing items #1 – 6, with assistance from the Department Chair/School Director in obtaining materials for items #3 - 5; the D-CPER committee, Department Chair/School Director, and college dean are responsible for appending materials contained in #7.

Items #1 – 5 constitute the review materials utilized by the D-CPER committee, the chair, and the dean in evaluating the faculty member's performance. Items included in #6 are optionally made available to evaluators at the department level only, but are not transmitted to the college level unless the dean and/or the C-CPER committee (should one be required) specifically request them. This information is summarized in the table below.

<i>Review Activity</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Dept. Review</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>College Review</i>	X	X	X	X	X	(X)	(X)

Items #1-6 should be posted in the official Faculty Review folder for review by D-CPER committee members, chair, dean, and C-CPER committee (when such a committee is formed). Item #7 should be uploaded to the official Faculty Review folder when completed.

## **Checklist**

The [checklist forms](#) are available on the Academic Affairs' website as a PDF document.

### **1. Professional Vitae**

<i>Name and Contact Information</i>	This should include UTSA address, phone number, and email address, as well as current academic rank (for example, Assistant Professor or Associate Professor).
<i>Educational Background</i>	List all institutions from which a degree was earned, including the degree received and the major field of study. Awards received while a student at an educational institution may also be listed here.
<i>Professional Employment History</i>	List all positions held in sequential order, with applicable dates, since earning the baccalaureate degree, including the present position at UTSA.
<i>Awards and Honors</i>	List any awards, honors, prizes, competitions, or other recognition received related to professional activities.
<i>Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities Summary</i>	Summarize all products of research/scholarly/creative activities, including publications, exhibitions, performances, architectural projects, reviews, or other documentation of scholarly contributions. <i>All products should include the date and title of publication/exhibition/performance, the impact (e.g. impact factors, citations, Almetrics, etc.) the venue, and where applicable, the inclusive page numbers or size of the scholarly contribution.</i> List separately the different types of publications (e.g. journal articles, books, reviews, etc.), scholarly products, or creative activity outcomes, providing respective listings of invited contributions, refereed contributions, and non-refereed contributions. Use separate headings for publication status such as Published, Accepted, Under Review/Submitted, and In preparation with published works listed first.
<i>Scholarly Presentations</i>	List all external oral or poster presentations at conferences, meetings, or other institutions/universities related to scholarly work, and provide the dates and locations of presentations. Use separate listings for invited presentations, refereed contributions, and non-refereed contributions.

*Granting Activities*

Provide a list of grants received, whether for research, instructional, or public service activities (indicate one of these for each grant), giving the name of the granting agency, the project dates, the project title, and the total amount awarded for each.

*Intellectual Property*

Where applicable, provide a summary of any intellectual property generated and indicate any patent applications, copyright privileges, licensing, or other commercialization that has resulted. The summary should include dates, titles, and other suitable identifying information.

*Teaching Activities*

List all formal courses taught, indicating the level of the course (undergraduate or graduate) and its title. Provide a list of students mentored in research/scholarly/creative activities and any theses or dissertations directed. Summarize any service on graduate committees and for student advising.

*Service Activities*

Provide separate listings of all committee assignments, assigned administrative activities (for example, Department Chair/School Director, center directorship, *etc.*), and professional service activities (including leadership in disciplinary organizations, service as a journal editor, manuscript or grant proposal reviewer, meetings or symposia organized, *etc.*). Each activity should include the dates of participation, the organizational level of the activity (for example, department, college, *etc.*), and any leadership roles played.

***2. Summary of Professional Accomplishments and COVID-19 Impact Checklist***

The summary of professional accomplishments should be succinct and provide only the highlights of the faculty member's noteworthy accomplishments during the evaluation period. This is not intended to be a restatement of the curriculum vitae. In addition to the summary, one-to-two paragraphs may be devoted to outlining plans for professional activities over the coming evaluation period. The summary should ideally be no longer than two pages in total.

We also recognize that the COVID-19 pandemic may have caused varying disruptions to faculty in their teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service goals. Furthermore, we understand that these disruptions impact individual faculty in unique ways, based on differing responsibilities and circumstances, and differing timescales and intensities. The [COVID 19 Impact Checklist](#) allows faculty to provide information on disruptions to their teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and/or service that provide additional, important evaluation context.

### **3. Summary of Student Course Evaluation Survey Results**

Provide a table of courses taught during the evaluation period using the template provided below (this template may be downloaded from the Academic Affairs' website). Do not include copies of student evaluation surveys or comments among these materials. If you have IDEA surveys, please use the adjusted figure for course ratings and instructor ratings. The online course surveys provide average ratings under the "Essential Statements" portion of the survey.

<i>Semester</i>	<i>Course No.</i>	<i>Course Type</i>	<i>New Prep?</i>	<i>Course Enrollment</i>	<i>No. of Responses</i>	<i>Course Rating</i>	<i>Instructor Rating</i>
SP2011	ABC.nnn3	LD, UD or GR	NEW	Xxx	Yyy	X.X	Y.Y
Note: LD = lower division, UD = upper division, GR = graduate level							

### **4. Peer Observation Report(s)**

Provide peer observer's report(s) and faculty member's report(s) for each instance in which the department has performed a peer observation of teaching since previous comprehensive review. Please refer to the Peer Observation Guidelines and your Department Chair/School Director for assistance in completing this task.

### **5. Annual Reports**

Annual reports should be submitted by the faculty member for each of the years comprising the evaluation period. The Department Chair/School Director may assist in providing these materials.

### **6. Optional Supplementary Materials**

Faculty members may submit optional supplementary materials as electronic documents posted to SharePoint to highlight or document achievement in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activities, and service activities, particularly those highlighted in the summary of professional accomplishments (#3). A checklist of possible items that might be included among the supplementary materials is available from the Academic Affairs' website.

Once the department-level evaluations are completed, the optional supplementary materials may remain available during the dean and/or C-CPER committee's evaluation of the review packet. In extraordinary cases, where additional supplementary materials might clarify a point made in the departmental review, the dean and/or C-CPER committee may request these materials.

Please note that collecting supplementary materials in digital format is the responsibility of the faculty member. Assistance in creating digital archives is available through the Office of Information Technology and the University Library. By storing these materials online, the intent is that they are made accessible for the convenience of the D-CPER and C-CPER committees, Department Chair/School Director, and dean to assist in their separate deliberations.

## **7. Evaluation and Review Materials**

As the review packet goes through the evaluation process, each level of review should append its report to the packet for consideration by the next level of review. Guidelines for these various levels of review are provided in the “Review Process” section of these guidelines below. The materials should be arranged in the following order, with the responsibility and timing for appending each set of materials indicated below:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Responsible Individual</i>	<i>When</i>
D-CPER committee report Chair’s evaluation report	Department Chair/School Director	Upon completion of department-level evaluation
C-CPER committee report (if convened)	Dean	Upon completion of departmental review, if needed.
Dean’s evaluation(s)*	Dean	Upon completion of all prior reviews.

\*If a C-CPER committee is convened the Dean will write a final evaluation memo summarizing the review.

## **Review Process**

The process for CPE review normally involves three levels, including the D-CPER committee, the chair, and the dean. If the final evaluation indicates unsatisfactory performance in one or more areas of activity, the dean may appoint, with the consent of the faculty member, a C-CPER committee to evaluate the review packet.

### **1. Membership of the Department CPE Review committee**

The membership of the D-CPER committee is determined by the following process:

- The voting faculty of each department shall elect members to serve on the D-CPER committee in years that a faculty member is undergoing CPE review. Only tenured faculty are eligible to serve on a CPE Review committee.
- The D-CPER committee should have at least three (3) tenured faculty members of equal or greater rank to the faculty member(s) under review. Faculty who are appointed as part-time administrators are eligible to serve on the D-CPER committee; however, this should not include any individuals who otherwise participate in later stages of the CPE review.
- If there are fewer than three (3) eligible faculty members available to serve on the committee, the Department Chair/School Director, in consultation with the dean, may invite full professors from other departments to participate as members of the department CPE Review committee.

- When the faculty member undergoing a CPE is the Department Chair/School Director, the dean shall appoint another faculty member at or above the academic rank of the Department Chair/School Director to serve in the role of Department Chair/School Director for this process.
- The D-CPER committee shall elect its own chair.
- The Department Chair/School Director will certify the election of members and of the committee chair and provide the dean with a list of the membership by September 10<sup>th</sup>.

## ***2. Membership of the College-level CPE Review committee***

A C-CPER committee may be appointed by the dean, with the consent of the faculty member, when one or more areas of her/his performance are deemed to be unsatisfactory. This committee shall be constituted by the following procedure:

- Members may come from any department of the university, but must be tenured and hold rank equal to or greater than the faculty member under review.
- The dean shall appoint no fewer than three (3) members to the college-level CPE Review committee. More than three members may be appointed in the event that multiple faculty members have received unsatisfactory reviews.
- The membership of the C-CPER committee should be determined by January 15<sup>th</sup>.
- The C-CPER committee shall elect its own chair.
- The C-CPER committee may be used to consider more than one CPE review in a given year, if needed.

## ***3. Roles of Review Entities***

All reports are ultimately advisory to the dean, who governs the CPE review process for faculty. The role of each entity may be summarized as follows:

**D-CPER committee**— conducts a full review of the faculty member’s performance during the evaluation period. The Department CPE Review should afford the faculty member an opportunity to meet with the committee, if requested by either the D-CPER committee or the faculty member being reviewed, to clarify aspects of her/his performance. If the analysis of the record raises performance concerns, the committee may request additional documentation from the faculty member.

The final report from the department committee will provide an evaluation for each area and an overall evaluation, using the ratings listed in HOP 2.22 (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, fails to meet expectations, and unsatisfactory), but will not include a narrative or summary unless one or more areas or the overall evaluation is one of “fails to meet expectations” or “unsatisfactory.” The report must be signed by the members of the committee.

**Department Chair/School Director**— conducts a full review of the faculty member’s performance during the evaluation period, from the perspective of how that performance addresses the mission and responsibilities of the department, subject to the protections of academic freedom. The chair should independently evaluate the review packet, but consider the report of the D-CPER committee in arriving at a recommended evaluation in each area of performance and an overall evaluation. The Department Chair/School Director’s report should contain an evaluation for each area and an overall evaluation, using the ratings in HOP 2.22

The chair’s report should fully explain the reasons for any differences of opinion with the D-CPER committee report. When the review packet is forwarded to the college, the chair shall notify the candidate(s) in writing about the conclusion of the departmental evaluation, indicating if there are any areas judged to be unsatisfactory. Ideally, the Chair should provide verbal feedback to the D-CPER committee at the end of the departmental review and discuss areas of concurrence and disagreement.

**Dean**— an independent, comprehensive review of the review packet, taking the D-CPER committee, and Department Chair/School Director’s analysis and recommendations into consideration. The dean’s report should contain an evaluation for each area and an overall evaluation, using the ratings in HOP 2.22, but will not ordinarily include a narrative or summary unless he/she disagrees with the D-CPER or Department Chair/School Director analysis. In addition, if any area of performance is evaluated as “unsatisfactory” the dean should provide a written analysis. The dean may optionally append narrative to commend faculty for noteworthy performance over the review period.

Once approved by the Provost, Academic Affairs will communicate the final CPE results in writing to the faculty member, the Department Chair/School Director, the Dean. When the review packet is forwarded to Academic Affairs, the Dean shall notify the candidate(s) informally about the conclusion of the evaluation, including indicating if there are any areas judged to be unsatisfactory. Ideally, the dean should provide verbal feedback to the Department Chair/School Director at the end of his or her review and discuss areas of concurrence and disagreement.

**C-CPER committee**— a general evaluation of the review packet, but focusing on those areas in which performance was deemed unsatisfactory by prior reviews (D-CPER, Department Chair/School Director and/or dean). The C-CPER committee should provide a report analyzing the earlier evaluations and providing its independent analysis of the problematic areas in the CPE review. In cases where the C-CPER committee differs with the prior analysis, it should detail its reasons for the different conclusions. As with the departmental CPE review committee, the report should ideally characterize the consensus view of the committee; however, if no consensus is reached, then all perspectives should be represented in the report.

**Provost**— review the reports of the D-CPER committee, Department Chair/School Director, dean, and C-CPER committee (if utilized) and approve or amend any recommended follow-up actions.

The Provost notifies all faculty members undergoing CPE review of the final evaluation result and provides the date for the next CPE review, typically, six years from the previous review date.

#### ***4. General Guidelines for the D-CPER and C-CPER committees***

In addition to the policies expressed under HOP 2.22, the CPER committees should adhere to the following guidelines. Careful adherence to these policies and guidelines is necessary to ensure a fair, objective, and consistent process throughout the analysis of each CPE review.

- The CPER committees function exclusively to conduct internal peer evaluations for the purpose of making recommendations on the evaluation of faculty performance.
- Faculty members serving on the D-CPER committee have the responsibility to read **all** review packet materials, to review the applicant's performance in each of the performance criteria thoroughly and to participate in committee discussions and formulation of committee recommendations. Participation by proxy is not appropriate.
- Faculty members serving on the C-CPER committee have the responsibility to read **all** review packet materials, with special focus on the materials related to the initial evaluation of unsatisfactory performance, and to participate in committee discussions and formulation of committee recommendations. Participation by proxy is not appropriate.
- When a recommendation of "unsatisfactory" is made, the D-CPER committee's report will include an analysis that should indicate the factors that contributed to the committee's recommendations **and** illuminate any factors that were prominently cited during the deliberations that would have been supportive of a contrary or alternative recommendation. This would also apply to the report from the C-CPER committee, should this committee be convened.
- Recommendations should be based on consistently applied criteria appropriate for the faculty candidate's academic discipline and that reflect the expected workload distribution as reported by the chair.
- Faculty serving on a CPER committee should focus on factual information and guard against inaccuracies caused by either emphasis or omission of information.
- Faculty may serve on only one level of CPE review for a given faculty member, unless exception is granted by the dean.
- Only tenured faculty members may serve on a CPER committee and only full professors may serve when evaluating the performance of a full professor. If those committees, when constituted in accordance with the *Handbook of Operating Procedures* and college bylaws, have fewer than three tenured full professors, the chair shall nominate and the dean shall appoint additional full professors until there are three on the committee.
- The CPER committee report should be signed by all participating members of the review committee. On the signature page, the report should include a header that read: **"We, the undersigned members of the CPE Review committee have reviewed this report for completeness and accuracy, and attest that we have reached our**

**recommendations through a thorough review and discussion of the available documentary evidence.”**

Each dean is responsible for reviewing policies and procedures and these guidelines with Department Chair/School Directors and for assuring that these policies, procedures and instructions are followed.

### ***5. Guidelines for Department Chair/School Director’s Evaluation***

The chair’s report should contain the following essential elements:

- a copy of the D-CPER committee’s report;
- an analysis of the candidate’s contributions in each of the areas of teaching, research/ scholarly/ creative activity, and service within the context of the department’s needs;
- a succinct statement of the chair’s recommendation, with explanation of the factors leading to this recommendation, especially in those areas where the chair may disagree with the D-CPER committee’s conclusions.

The chair should strive to compose the report using factual data to support conclusions, and draw clear connections for how the faculty member’s performance contributes to the department’s fundamental missions of teaching, research, and service, and helps the department improve its overall performance.

### ***6. Guidelines for Dean’s Evaluation***

In all cases, the dean’s evaluation should provide the following essential information:

- the nature of the department’s recommendations through the D-CPER committee and chair,
- a succinct statement of the dean’s evaluation and any recommendations for developmental activities to improve performance.

If the CPE Review committee and chair have provided analyses and recommendations with which the dean is in agreement, then the dean may provide a succinct statement of concurrence with the earlier analyses.

If earlier recommendations express diverse outcomes, or if the dean disagrees with their conclusions, then a more comprehensive report explaining the rationale for the dean’s conclusion should be provided. The dean should take care to express conclusions within the context of the college’s expectations and aspirations for long-term quality among its faculty.

**Retention of CPE Documents**

CPE documents are retained in accordance with the university's official retention schedule, as follows:

- Record series 3.1.119 Performance Appraisals – All supporting documentation and review materials are retained for 2 years following the CPE review conclusion date.

The university's full records retention schedule can be accessed through the following link:  
<https://www.utsa.edu/openrecords/retention.html>