

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT**  
**UCCSN BOARD OF REGENTS HANDBOOK**  
**TITLE 4, Chapter 3, NEW Section 3**  
Additions are in **Boldface**; Deletions are [~~stricken~~ in brackets].

**Section 3.        Evaluations**

1.    **The UCCSN Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.11.1 and 5.11.2, establishes that written performance evaluations of academic faculty and administrative faculty shall be conducted at least once annually by department chairs, supervisors or heads of administrative units. One of the purposes of annual performance evaluations is to provide constructive, developmental feedback to the faculty member.**
2.    **All performance evaluations shall include a rating of (i) “excellent,” (ii) “commendable,” (iii) “satisfactory,” or (iv) “unsatisfactory.” The areas of evaluation and procedures for evaluation of academic faculty and administrative faculty are established in institutional bylaws. Evaluations of instructional faculty shall include an assessment of teaching evaluations completed by their students. The performance evaluations of executive and supervisory faculty shall include consultation with the professional and classified staff of the appropriate administrative unit. The evaluation of the presidents and the chancellor shall follow guidelines approved by the Board of Regents.**
3.    **The annual performance evaluation of tenured faculty is addressed in UCCSN Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.12.**
4.    **Academic and administrative faculty shall, upon request, have access to materials used by the supervisor in writing the evaluation, including the results of, but not the originals of, student evaluations and comments, and in the case of administrative faculty whose evaluations include surveys, the results of, but not the originals or copies of, such surveys. In responding to such a request, the supervisor must ensure the anonymity of the students and the survey respondents. With the exception of the results of such student evaluations and comments and such surveys, anonymous materials shall not be considered by the supervisor.**
5.    **Academic and administrative faculty who disagree with the supervisor’s evaluation may submit a written rejoinder and/or request a peer evaluation as provided in the institution’s bylaws. The supervisor’s official evaluation and the faculty member’s rejoinder and/or peer evaluation will be retained in the faculty member’s personnel file.**
6.    **Academic or administrative faculty members receiving an overall rating of “unsatisfactory” on their evaluation shall be provided with constructive feedback in the written evaluation for improving their performance. This constructive feedback must include a written plan for improvement, which must be specific and must be provided at the time of the first “unsatisfactory” rating.**
7.    **Academic faculty in tenure-track positions shall, in addition to the annual written evaluation, be entitled to a written mid-tenure review of their progress toward tenure. The procedures for the review shall be described in each institution’s bylaws. Notwithstanding a positive mid-tenure review, the award of tenure remains a discretionary act as provided in the University and Community College System of Nevada Code.**