

# POST-TENURE REVIEW HANDBOOK



Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts

1/15/2015

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Message to the MCLA Faculty	1
Questions about PTR	2
Portfolio Security	3
Article VIII-C Post Tenure Review: Changes in the 2012-2014 Contract	4-7
• Narrative/Statement Requirement	4
• Ratings	4
• Some Considerations	5-6
• Classroom Observation (Faculty)	7
• Direct Observations (Librarians)	7
Organization Guidelines	8
Mandatory Statement	8
Options for Organizing the Portfolio	9-13
Evidence/Criteria	14-15
Portfolio Documents	16-18
Portfolio Evidence/Criteria for Librarians	19
Considerations of Fairness	20
Additional Considerations	21
PTR: The Right to Respond	22-23
Timelines for PTR	24
Special Thanks	25
Appendices	



## **A Message to MCLA Faculty**

This is the second edition of the PTR Handbook. This edition reflects changes in the 2014-2017 Contract. A concerted effort was made to develop a comprehensive guide but some sections may need to be improved in future editions. I hope you will find this handbook helpful.

The PTR Handbook is both a guide and a summary of the applicable provisions found in the collective bargaining agreement. The agreement is posted on the MSCA website at [www.mscaunion.org](http://www.mscaunion.org). This document was prepared by Michele Ethier. While I believe that the statements contained in this handbook are accurate, I welcome questions, comments, and clarification for future editions.

**Post-tenure review with a 6%, 3%, 0% adjustment warranted is earned. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate that s/he has fulfilled the criteria that pertain to this personnel action.**

The following handbook may be useful to candidates seeking PTR:

### **The Portfolio Handbook**

## Questions about PTR

Does PTR weaken or strengthen tenure?

Does PTR undermine academic freedom?

Is PTR's sole purpose to placate politicians and the public clamor for accountability?

Does PTR have a negative effect on hiring?

Are there benefits to PTR (beyond money) for faculty?

Does PTR benefit the university?

Has the state increased the budget for public higher education since the introduction of PTR?

Does PTR have a chilling effect on outspoken professors, controversial research, and viewpoints that challenge the status quo and the university administration?

Does PTR promote quantity over quality?

Is PTR necessary? Is it true that faculty cease working, slow down or reduce productivity after tenure?

Does PTR support the assumption that the university is loaded with dead wood?

Does PTR help the university get rid of dead wood?

How does PTR correlate with research that suggests faculty are even more committed to the university after tenure?

Is our system of PTR (which is attached to salary adjustment) better than those that are not?

Is PTR ageist?

Does PTR affect faculty morale?

Does PTR help address compression and inversion?

Is there something other than or better than PTR to address salary stagnation?

Is PTR just a benign outgrowth of our assessment obsessed culture?

Does PTR foster competition over cooperation?

Is PTR similar to a popularity or beauty contest, an IDOL show for academics?

Is PTR here to stay?

**\*These questions are not addressed in this handbook.**

## **Portfolio Security**

Portfolios are secured in or near the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) Office. Documents within the portfolio may not be removed or photocopied. Portfolio materials are confidential documents.

## **PTR**

### Article VIII-C Post Tenure Review

\*Some changes have been made in the contract since PTR was initiated.

- You are no longer required to be reviewed under PTR
- No more alternative 1 or alternative 2
- The length of the PTR Review period has changed: (see chart)
  - A. Initial Post-tenure Review – must hold tenure for 6 years before consideration for PTR
  - B. Subsequent Post-Tenure Review – Six years plus the evaluation year for the previous PTR. In other words, the last 7 years since you handed your PTR file to the VP or think of academic years rather than calendar years.

Eligibility: 6 years after the date of tenure or 6 years after the end of the PTR evaluation year.

#### Narrative Requirement

Very Important: Unlike reappointment, tenure and promotion where a narrative self-evaluation is not required (although highly recommended), a statement or narrative is required under PTR.

#### Ratings

The evaluative ratings of exemplary, meritorious and unacceptable were eliminated in the 2012-2014 contract. The percentage pay increases remain the same:

- 6% adjustment warranted
- 3% adjustment warranted
- 0% adjustment warranted

The adjustment of 6% or 3% is on the base of the faculty or librarians salary on the preceding October 1 and takes effect on the preceding July 1. In other words, it's retroactive.

A rating of 0% or no adjustment warranted does not affect a faculty or librarians eligibility for promotion.

### **Some Considerations under PTR**

You cannot go up for Promotion and PTR in the same year. Notice for both Promotion and PTR is April 1. The candidate can choose which personnel action to be evaluated on.

You may rescind your application to be reviewed under PTR up until April 1. After April 1, you may only postpone PTR evaluation for emergency or medical reasons.

Faculty and Librarians who do not give notice that they want to be evaluated the year they are eligible, remain eligible in the future. Once eligible, you remain eligible until reviewed.

If you want a 6% adjustment on your salary then you need to ask for it. How?

I am seeking a 6% salary adjustment. I am providing a substantial portfolio in support of this personnel action.

Or

You will find that I have earned a 6% salary adjustment. My portfolio substantiates this claim.

Or

The evidence within this portfolio will confirm that I deserve a 6% salary adjustment warranted.

Or

The narrative self evaluation which follows includes the criteria that I believe warrants a 6% salary adjustment. I am providing a substantial portfolio with evidence that supports this contention.

Or

Your own unique way.....

Please note: Letters of support are not required by the contract under PTR or any other personnel action. You can ask your Department Chair to support a particular criteria: teaching, advising, scholarship, departmental service, public service, college service, or alternative responsibility **but the chair should not be reading your portfolio for PTR or making a recommendation in writing.**

**There is no PTR committee.**

**There is no PEC for PTR.**

The union feels strongly that the onus (burden or blame) for the decision regarding whether you receive a 6%, 3% or 0% rating is on the Vice President of Academic Affairs and **only** the VP or her/his delegate, the Academic Dean.

The only reviewer/evaluator for PTR is the Vice President for Academic Affairs or his/her delegate, the Academic Dean. You can appeal to the President (see PTR- The Right to Respond included in this handbook) if you receive a 0 or 3%.

The PTR Portfolio is submitted to the Vice President of Academic Affairs by September 30. The Vice President or Academic Dean must complete the review of all PTR files by April 1 of the review year. **The Vice President/Academic Dean is allowed to consult with the candidate's Department Chair, or for Librarians, the Library Director.**

## **Classroom Observations (Faculty)/Direct Observations (Librarians)**

The Department Chair must do a classroom evaluation in the fall of the year you submit your PTR file. This classroom evaluation can be submitted after September 30<sup>th</sup>. It will then be added to the file. For Librarians, a direct observation of your performance must be conducted in the Fall by the Library Director and added to the file. You may include additional observations. If the Department Chair does not hold tenure or is also up for PTR in the same year as another department colleague, then a tenured member of the department (elected by other tenured members) does the classroom evaluation. The colleague elected to chair in place of the chair up for PTR serves as chair for **all** candidates in the department up for PTR.

If there are no other tenured members in the department, then a tenured member from a cognate department is elected by the tenured members of the affected department (or by the tenure track members of that department, if there are no tenured members other than the department chair.) Consultation with the Academic Vice President to determine a cognate department is recommended.

### **Contractual Criteria**

When discussing your work, achievements and accomplishments, you must be inclusive of the review period. For example, you must address all criteria over the 6 years for initial PTR and 7 years for subsequent PTR. For example, don't comment on your teaching for the first three years and your scholarship for the last 4 years. You will need to address teaching and scholarship over the entire time frame and review period. Documentation for entire review period is required.

**Because of retirements and resignations, a new PTR list of eligibility needs to be created by the administration each year and distributed to all faculty.**

**The President must submit a final list of faculty names and ratings to the MCLA President of the Faculty Association each year.**

## Organization Guidelines

**Please note: The primary evaluator for PTR is the Academic Vice President or his/her delegate, the Academic Dean.** In fairness to the evaluator, it is important to spend some time organizing your portfolio so that it is easy to read and locate documents. Consider using a table of contents, tabs or dividers and numbering pages. Be sure to include all mandatory materials and be selective about optional materials. The quality of your work, and not the quantity of documents, is what counts in the evaluation process. You could have one narrative for all evaluative criteria at the beginning of the portfolio or a separate narrative for each criterion before the specific section. Your narrative could be broken into subsections following the criteria found on Appendix A-1 for faculty and A-2 for librarians. Your portfolio could also be broken into subdivisions using tabs or dividers and following the mandatory evaluation criteria found on Appendix A-1/A-2, (see Article VIII of the Agreement). In other words, include a discussion in your narrative and a subsection within your portfolio on: teaching effectiveness, academic advising, continuing scholarship, professional activities, and alternative assignments (if applicable). For additional suggestions on portfolio organization, see "A Guide to the Selection and Organization of Evaluation Materials" by Patricia Markunas in the [MSCA Perspective](#), Summer 2010. See also **Options for Organizing the Portfolio** included in this handbook.

**It is recommended that all candidates for PTR attend a portfolio and/or PTR workshop sponsored by the Faculty Association and the VPAA.** This workshop is offered annually.

### **Mandatory Statement:**

**The narrative is not an optional document under PTR.** The Agreement requires a statement (127). A statement in which the faculty member addresses what they checked off on Appendix A-1 or the librarian checks off on Appendix A-2 is a requirement under post-tenure review. This statement/narrative is important for a number of reasons. First, it helps to focus the evaluator on your unique and significant contributions, as well as provide you with an opportunity to highlight the substantial evidence provided in your portfolio. The documents help verify and demonstrate that you've fulfilled the criteria that pertain to post-tenure review and the narrative helps you explain your professional self to the evaluator who may be unfamiliar with your work. The narrative allows you to frame the portfolio in light of your individual strengths and allows you to address any weaknesses in terms of how you will make changes to improve them. It states clearly why you have earned a 6% rating under Post-Tenure Review.

## **Some Options for Organizing the Portfolio For PTR**

The following options are suggestions **only**. **The Contract/Agreement does not address organization of the Portfolio for Personnel Actions.** There are many ways to organize the portfolio. There is no one right way. These are just suggestions.

### **Option 1:**

Introduction – an overall statement of the personnel action you seek which is PTR and that you have earned it. For example: I am seeking a 6% adjustment warranted under PTR. I am providing a substantial portfolio in support of this personnel action. **OR** I am Jane Doe and this is my work. You will find that I have earned a 6% adjustment warranted under PTR. My portfolio substantiates this claim. **OR** The evidence within this portfolio will confirm that I deserve a salary adjustment of 6% under PTR. **OR** your own unique way of introducing yourself and your work.

Table of Contents

Appendix A-1 (faculty) or A-2 (librarians)

Appendix B and CV

## Narrative Self Evaluation on all contractual criteria:

### Faculty

Teaching Effectiveness

Academic Advising

Continuing Scholarship

Professional Activities

Alternative Assignments

### Librarians

Library Effectiveness

Effectiveness with Students, faculty, others

Continuing Scholarship

Professional Activities

Alternative Assignments

### Appendices:

**Course Documents:** syllabi, Sir II's, classroom visitations, and other optional documents such as selected assignments, exams, paper topics, etc.

**Advising:** no documents are mandated. Optional documents might include flow sheets you created, analysis of advising on Sir II's, your advising philosophy, your mentorship of students, other, etc. Although no documents are required in this category you are evaluated on advising and therefore the candidate must provide something for evaluators to evaluate. It's the classic catch 22 or double-bind.

**Continuing Scholarship (Category 1):** documents to support contributions to your discipline, participation in professional organizations, research both published and unpublished, artistic creations and activities, other (such as unconventional products.) What you include here depends on what you

checked off on A-1 or A-2 but you can include other documents that address the categories you have not checked.

**Professional Activities (Category II)**: documents to support public service, departmental service, college service, 30+ advisees, other. What you include here depends on what you checked off on A-1 or A-2 but you can include other documents.

**Alternative Assignments**: documents to support your alternative service as chair, work in counseling center, other alternative assignments (anything you received a course reduction for,) professional development program, other.

**With Option 1 the evaluator reads the narrative and then locates the documents that support the claims made in the narrative. The evaluator will need to flip back and forth between the narrative and the appropriate appendix. Candidates should make it logical and sequential. Consider using page numbers, tabs and dividers.**

## **Option 2**

Introduction (same as above)

Appendix A-1 or A-2

Appendix B and CV

## Table of Contents

Narrative Self Evaluation for Each contractual criterion with documents following each criterion.

- A. Narrative Self Evaluation on Teaching  
Teaching Documents
- B. Narrative Self Evaluation on Advising  
Advising Documents (optional)
- C. Narrative Self Evaluation on Continuing Scholarship  
Scholarship Documents
- D. Narrative Self Evaluation on Professional Activities  
Professional Activities Documents
- E. Narrative Self Evaluation on Alternative Assignments (if any)  
Alternative Service Documents

**Option 2 reads like a book.**

### **Option 3**

Narrative Self Evaluation on Teaching

Teaching Documents

Appendix A-1 or A-2

Appendix B and CV

## Table of Contents

Narrative on all other criteria

Documents on all other criteria broken up by dividers or tabs.

**Option 3 rationale: Candidate feels strongly that because state universities are primarily teaching institutions, other documents are of secondary importance.**

PLEASE NOTE: Under PTR a statement/narrative is required.

**Where does sabbatical work belong in the portfolio?**

**Sabbaticals are for study and research (broadly defined). In part it depends on what you did during your sabbatical. It could be included as a separate category or under continuing scholarship or professional activities. I suppose an argument could be made to include it under alternative service since you receive multiple course reductions during a sabbatical. Use your best judgment. I would hope that evaluators would not penalize you if they disagree with your interpretation of where to put sabbatical work. The Contract does not seem to address where it should be placed.**

**The opinions expressed here are mine and mine alone. The options included here are those that I have read most often when serving as Chair, on PEC's the COT and COP. There are certainly other possibilities and ways to combine the options to fit your own unique presentation of self. There is no one right way.**

## Three General Rules to Consider:

1. Follow Contractual Criteria
2. Mandatory documents before optional documents
3. Reverse chronological order (most recent first)

### Evidence/Criteria

A candidate's portfolio should show evidence of the following:

- Teaching effectiveness (for faculty).
- Academic advising (for faculty). If a faculty member has more than 30 advisees, she/he can elect to have those considered under category II of Continuing Scholarship.
- Effectiveness in performing assigned responsibilities (for librarians).
- Effectiveness in rendering assistance to students, faculty, and the academic community (for librarians).
- Continuing scholarship.
- Professional activities.
- Alternative assignments (if any).

The evaluation is conducted according to the criteria selected by the candidate on Appendix A-1 or A-2. These are as follows:

#### *Continuing Scholarship*

*Candidates are required to select one criterion for continuing scholarship but may choose to select more.*

- Contribution to the content of the discipline (for faculty); contribution to the content and pedagogy of the discipline through the development of library programs or library services (for librarians).
- Participation in or contribution to professional organizations and societies.
- Research as demonstrated by published or unpublished work.

- Artistic or other creative activities.
- Work toward the terminal degree or relevant post graduate study.
- Other, as explained by the candidate.

### Professional Activities

*Candidates are required to select one criterion for professional activities but may choose to select more.*

- Public Service.
- Contributions to the professional growth and development of the College Community.(May include academic advising of students in excess of 30 as assigned at the beginning of the semester).
- Other, as explained by the candidate.

### Alternative Assignments

*This is only considered if the candidate has an alternative assignment and, if so, the individual must be evaluated in the role of:*

- Chair.
- Alternative Professional Responsibilities.
- Professional development program.
- Other, as explained by the candidate.

**Alternative Assignment applies to anyone who receives a course reduction for any reason.**

### Evaluation Standards

**The basis of the evaluation is “professional quality demonstrated with reference to each of the applicable criteria.”**

Please note: Portfolios must be submitted in hard copy. This is required. An identical electronic copy is optional.

## PORTFOLIO DOCUMENTS FOR PTR

	<b><u>Mandatory</u></b> Professional Activities "Checklist" Appendix A-1 or A-2), most recent resume and Appendix B-1.	<b><u>Optional</u></b>	<b><u>Omit</u></b>
<b><u>Teaching Effectiveness</u></b>	<p><b><u>single syllabus</u></b>/outline for <u>each</u> course taught during review period. e.g. If you taught multiple sections of a course or the same course multiple semesters, submit a single syllabus.</p> <p><b><u>Student Evaluations</u></b> (SIR-II results for each course) A. 1 section of each type of course</p> <p><b><u>Classroom Visits:</u></b> Appendix: D-1(a) Dept. Chair: Fall Semester you submit your PTR file.</p> <p><b><u>Classroom Observation Clarification:</u></b> Post-observation visit (where chair visits with candidate) to discuss the class is done PRIOR to completing D-1a or D-1b (classroom observation/distance observation forms)</p>	<p>Sample of course materials you developed: exams, paper topics, assignments, outlines, powerpoint presentations, bibliography</p> <p>own formative or summative data (follow data collection guidelines) Signed letters from students to document teaching effectiveness.</p>	<p>Multiple syllabi for a single course unless substantial changes were made.</p> <p>Anonymous, unsigned letters from students</p> <p>Articles written by other people about teaching effectiveness or pedagogical techniques, copies of student work, routine email correspondence about scheduling, etc.</p> <p>DGCE Evaluations</p> <p>Multiple copies of "Interpreting SIRII Results")</p>
<b><u>Teaching (other)</u></b>	Narrative Statement		
<b><u>Advising</u></b>	None	Narrative description and data about advising load	Schedule from office door, weekly office hours, or schedules for advising appointments

	<b>Mandatory</b>	<b>Optional</b>	<b>Omit</b>
<b>Continuing Scholarship</b>	<p><b>Category I on Appendix A-1 (must check 1)</b> and provide <u>appropriate documentation</u></p> <p><b>Options:</b> Unpublished papers, publications, presentations, artistic creations, nontraditional/unconventional “products”</p> <p><b>For work in progress:</b> recent draft or proposal, current status of the project and timeline for completion.</p> <p><b>For conference attended:</b> documentation of sessions attended, continuing ed. credits, certificate of attendance, single registration document for conference.</p>	May check more than one but will be evaluated on all that are checked	<p>Routine correspondence about activity</p> <p>Drafts of work already completed</p> <p>Conference registration info</p> <p>Resumes or publications by collaborators</p> <p>Inclusion of entire conference booklet (copy only the cover &amp; page that includes your name (highlighted))</p> <p>Copies of student research you sponsored.</p>
<b>Professional Activities</b>	<p><b>Category II on Appendix A-1 (must check 1) For <u>committee/organizational assignments:</u></b> letter of appreciation from committee chair or org. president. If you produced significant document include. If you are an editor or on an editorial board, include recent issue of publication, awards from the college, awards from outside organizations, letters from community members documenting your activities, curriculum or program contributions, 30+ advisees</p>	May check more than one but will be evaluated on all that are checked	<p>Routine correspondence</p> <p>Copies of committee minutes/schedules</p> <p>Multiple copies of publications for which you served as editor or on an editorial board (cite in narrative)</p> <p>Work you judged as part of a contest or selected as part of a committee</p>

	<b>Mandatory</b>	<b>Optional</b>	<b>Omit</b>
<b>Alternative Assignment: (if applicable)</b>	<b>Category III of Appendix A-1</b> Formal evaluation(s) of assignment	List of assignments and or duties, semester and credit hours that apply , report or work product, Discussion in narrative	Inclusion of routine correspondence, minutes of meetings, vouchers, travel arrangements about assignment
<b>Other</b>	*If this is your first PTR and you were promoted after tenure see the Portfolio Handbook for other documents that could be included in your PTR file, e.g. PEC recommendation, additional classroom visits, etc.	Any written self evaluation submitted by the faculty member	Confidential/sensitive material Personal information
<b>PEC</b>	<b>Not required for PTR</b>		

## Portfolio Evidence/Criteria for Librarians

- Effectiveness in performing assigned responsibilities in the Library.
- Effectiveness in rendering assistance to students, faculty and the academic community.
- Direct observation of Librarian Performance: form needs to be developed. Librarians are responsible for developing the form.

See Appendix A-2 – (the checklist)

- I. Continuing Scholarship: (Candidates are required to select one criterion for continuing scholarship but may choose to select more.)
  - a. Contributions to the content and pedagogy of the discipline through the development of library programs or library services.
  - b. Participation in or contribution to professional organizations and societies.
  - c. Research as demonstrated by published or unpublished work.
  - d. Work toward the terminal degree or relevant post graduate study.
- II. Professional Activities:
  - Public Service
  - Contributions to the professional growth and development of the University. This service may include work on inter-institutional and system wide committees and service as a program area chair (without release time).
- III. Alternative Assignments (if applicable) – any assignment in lieu of the normal librarian workload in library services, may include a program of professional development or service as Library Program Area Chair.

**Please note:** Whenever a librarian teaches a credit-bearing course, his/her teaching will be evaluated under the provisions of Article VIII, the same as a faculty member's teaching.

### Evaluation Standards

The basis of the evaluation is "professional quality demonstrated with reference to each of the applicable criteria."

For promotion, the current Agreement states, "it being the understanding of the parties that for promotion to each higher rank a higher order of quality may be demanded."

### Materials to be used in the Evaluation of Librarians

- a. **Direct Observation and written evaluation of the Librarian's Performance: by Library Director or Library Program Area Chair**
- b. **(Appendix A-2 checklist)**
- c. **Appendix B and resume**
- d. **Additional Evaluation Reports (if librarian received a reduction in his/her workload) – does not include acting as an officer in the Faculty Association**

- e. Relevant materials submitted by the librarian being evaluated, including any written self-evaluation the librarian chooses to submit.
- f. Library Peer Evaluation Committee evaluates Librarians every 3<sup>rd</sup> year of service beginning in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year unless otherwise directed by the VP. There is no PEC for PTR.

### Considerations of Fairness

Both candidates and evaluators have a responsibility to be fair to each other. It is important that both share an understanding of the Agreement, the criteria of evaluation, and the evaluation process. A culture of shared expectations at MCLA will enhance the probability that personnel actions will be productive, respectful, and collegial.

#### A. Scholarship

Evaluation requires the exercise of academic judgment. Scholarship or pedagogy can vary across departments or even within a single department, so effort is needed to understand disciplines that are different from one's own. In Article VIII the Agreement states that

"In evaluating each member of the faculty, it shall be the responsibility of those charged with doing so to assess the quality, significance and relevance of that faculty member's continuing scholarship."

Please note that quantity is not an evaluative measure. What constitutes scholarship is open to interpretation and may involve both traditional, nontraditional and unconventional "products."

#### B. Contractual Criteria Only

Be objective and open-minded. Although it may seem obvious, remember to address only the contractual criteria and not extraneous matters such as personal interactions or department issues. Use only documentation provided in the portfolio. Evidence obtained or provided from other sources **cannot** be used in the evaluation. Evaluations should not include incidental observations.

#### C. Organization

**A candidate's file should be clearly organized** and include one or more of the following: a table of contents, tabs, sections, dividers, numbered pages. The Agreement does not address how to organize a portfolio. There is no one right way. See: Options for organizing the Portfolio included in this Handbook.

#### D. Missing Documents

**A candidate should provide a full and complete portfolio.** It is understood that evaluators may request missing documents (via appropriate channels or personnel) in order to make a clear and convincing, or full and complete, recommendation. Evaluators may not arbitrarily decide to request one or two missing documents from one candidate but not from another candidate. There is no limit on the number of appropriate documents that can be requested.

E. Categories

It shall be the responsibility of any member of the bargaining unit who is a candidate for PTR to verify and demonstrate that he/she has fulfilled the criteria that pertains to this personnel action. In applying these criteria, it should be understood that Massachusetts State Universities are primarily teaching institutions.

F. Professional Quality (Article VIII, A4, 91): Professional quality is **not defined** in the contract.

G. Meritorious Performance (Article VIII, Article xx): is **not defined** in the contract.

Additional Considerations:

1. Candidates cannot be compared.
2. Quotas are not allowed. Quotas for 6%, 3%, 0% are not allowed.
3. The VP or his/her delegate, the Academic Dean should not conduct an evaluation if to do so would constitute a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest.
4. All evaluators are bound to **keep confidential** all aspects of an evaluation.
5. The VP must provide clear and convincing reasons for no adjustment warranted, 3% adjustment warranted or 6% adjustment warranted.
6. Candidates for PTR do have the right to appeal if assessment is 0 or 3% (see The Right to Respond included in this handbook.)
7. Paid Work: Service cannot be discounted or ignored on the basis that candidate was compensated for the work. This applies to both faculty and librarians.

## **PTR – THE RIGHT TO RESPOND**

- VP\* completes review by April 1. S/he may consult with the chair of the department or Library Director.
- VP\* must provide clear and convincing reasons for rating of 0, 3, 6%.
- If you get less than (6%) faculty member has 10 days to respond in writing to the VP\*.
- Please note: we don't usually respond if the rating adjustment is 6%.
- 10 days after that, the faculty member can meet with the VP\* (accompanied by a union rep if desired.)
- 5 days after that, VP\* must render a final assessment. The VP\* cannot decrease the rating further but can increase it.
- If the response was unfavorable, 5 days following the VP's\* final assessment, the faculty member can appeal to the President.
- 10 days after that, the President convenes a meeting with the faculty member and at the faculty member's discretion (a union rep) to discuss the VP's\* assessment.
- Within 5 days of the meeting or 5 days of a written appeal if no meeting was requested, the President shall render a final decision.
- The VP\* and President must submit a list with the faculty member's name and rating to the Chapter President of the Faculty Association.
- A faculty member who receives a 3% or 0% has the right to:
  - a. Engage in a professional development plan
  - b. Take no further action
- If the faculty member elects a Professional Development Plan:
  - a. The VP\* prescribes the plan and its duration in consultation with the faculty member and Department Chair or Library Director.
  - b. The faculty member has the right to bring a union rep to any meeting with the VP\* or President when the plan of professional development is being discussed.
- The university bears any costs associated with the plan including the cost of workload reductions to complete the plan.
- The plan may be appealed to the President who has 7 days following the meeting to decide on the content of the plan.
- At the end of the period of professional development, the faculty member is reevaluated.
- If the VP\* gives the same rating that was given in the initial review, the faculty member can participate in an extended/revised plan for one academic year.

- After completing a second plan of professional development, the faculty member is evaluated again.
- If the faculty member is given the same rating, the process may repeat – another extension/a revised plan.
- During the period of professional development, the faculty member is entitled to be re-evaluated upon his/her request by the VP\*. A re-evaluation must be conducted within 30 days of the request.

**PLEASE NOTE: UNDER PTR, faculty CANNOT GRIEVE A RATING. You can grieve if you feel contractual procedure has not been followed.**

\*The Academic Vice President may delegate PTR decisions to the Academic Dean.

The following cannot evaluate a candidate for PTR:

Dean of Graduate Education or Graduate Studies

Dean of Continuing Education

Dean of Students

Dean of Enrollment Management

Dean of Admissions

Dean of Multicultural Affairs

Dean of Faculty Development

Notification Date of Administrator who will conduct PTR evaluations: 2015/2016 and thereafter by April 8<sup>th</sup>.

Timelines for PTR  
See current Personnel Calendar  
See Appendix M-III

If deadline falls on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday, the action is done on the next business day. Actions should be taken no later than the dates indicated.

- Materials submitted to VP 9/30
- Classroom visit by Chair See CPC
- VP completes review and transmits assessment to candidate 4/1
- VP transmits a list with the name and rating given to faculty under PTR to the Chapter President 4/1
- See also: PTR Right to Respond (included in this handbook)

CPC=Current Personnel Calendar

This Handbook was prepared by Michele Ethier, Professor of Social Work,  
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work  
at  
MCLA (Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts)

### **Special Thanks**

Thanks to Bridgewater State University for the use of their model, to Pat Markunas and the Employee Relations Committee (ERC) for printed guides sponsored by the MSCA, to Dana Rapp for editorial assistance, to Gerol Petruzella who uploaded the document to the MCLA website, to Matt Silliman for suggesting a clarification for the review period but especially to Maria LaValley who typed and retyped this document.