

**BOARD OF REGENTS
BRIEFING PAPER**

1. Agenda Item Title: Faculty Evaluation: NSHE Bylaw Amendment to Title 2, Section 5.12.2

2. BACKGROUND & POLICY CONTEXT OF ISSUE:

The University of Nevada Las Vegas is seeking to amend NSHE Title 2 Section 5.12.2 to clarify certain administrative practices.

3. SPECIFIC ACTIONS BEING RECOMMENDED OR REQUESTED:

This change to the Nevada System of Higher Education Code (Title 2) would allow each institution to utilize either a four-tiered or two-tiered evaluation of tenured faculty. In addition, a narrative in the annual evaluation would be required every three years if applicable.

4. IMPETUS (WHY NOW?):

This change to the Handbook would allow best practice System-wide for post-tenure academic faculty evaluation.

5. BULLET POINTS TO SUPPORT REQUEST/RECOMMENDATION:

- Institutions may choose between a two-tiered or four-tiered post-tenure evaluation scale of faculty.
- Fewer faculty peer-reviews or grievances involving an ambiguous scale would be required if a two-tiered evaluation scale is adopted.
- Since merit rankings may be linked to the four-tiered evaluation scale, a choice in post-tenure evaluation rankings allows each institution to adopt best practice.

6. POTENTIAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE REQUEST/RECOMMENDATION:

- Depending on the institution, tenured faculty may no longer receive either an Excellent or Commendable rating in their annual evaluations potentially providing less data for promotion decisions.

7. ALTERNATIVE(S) TO WHAT IS BEING REQUESTED/RECOMMENDED:

The only alternative is to do nothing, restricting System-wide best practice for post-tenure evaluation.

8. COMPLIANCE WITH BOARD POLICY:

- Consistent With Current Board Policy: Title # _____ Chapter # _____ Section # _____
 Amends Current Board Policy: Title # 2 Chapter # _____ Chapter # _____ Section # 5.12.2
 Amends Current Procedures & Guidelines Manual: Chapter # _____ Section # _____
 Other: _____
 Fiscal Impact: Yes _____ No X _____
Explain: _____

**PROPOSED *HANDBOOK* REVISION, NSHE CODE
TITLE 2, SECTION 5.12.2
Faculty Evaluations**

Additions appear in boldface underline, deletions are [~~stricken~~ and bracketed]

5.12.2 Procedures. All performance evaluations **of untenured faculty** shall include a rating of (i) "excellent," (ii) "commendable," (iii) "satisfactory," or (iv) "unsatisfactory." **All performance evaluations of tenured faculty shall include a rating of (i) "excellent," (ii) "commendable," (iii) "satisfactory," or (iv) "unsatisfactory" unless institutional bylaws require a rating of only (i) "satisfactory" or (ii) "unsatisfactory."** The areas of evaluation and procedures for evaluation of academic faculty and administrative faculty shall be established in Board policies and institutional bylaws. **All performance evaluations shall include a narrative addressing each area of performance, and at least every three years a narrative addressing progress toward tenure and/or promotion, if applicable. The three year narrative progress assessment shall be prepared in consultation with the appropriate tenure review committee or promotion committee, if any.** Evaluations of instructional faculty shall include an assessment [of] **incorporating** teaching evaluations completed by their students. (B/R 1/04)