

Guidelines for Comprehensive Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

1. Introduction

Comprehensive periodic review (CPR) of tenured faculty is required by *Texas Education Code* Section [51.942](#) (TXEC [51.942](#)), Regents' Rule [31102](#) (RR [31102](#)), and [HOP 2-2150](#). As stated in Regents' Rule [31102](#):

"Periodic evaluation is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. The purpose of periodic evaluation is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas."

Nothing in these Guidelines shall be interpreted or applied to infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights.

2. Definitions

Administrator refers to A&P roles held by tenured faculty including but not limited to department chair, director, associate dean, dean, vice provost, senior vice provost, provost, vice president, president, etc.

Administrative Supervisor refers to the supervisor of a faculty member who has served or is serving as an Administrator (e.g., provost, senior vice provost, vice president).

3. Requirements

These Guidelines incorporate requirements laid out in *Texas Education Code* Section [51.942](#), and the Regents' Rule [31102](#). Most importantly:

- a) Each faculty candidate under review must receive one of four ratings for their overall review:

"Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory." (RR [31102](#)).

In addition to the required single holistic rating, the committee must provide a rating for each of the relevant area(s) of specialization.

- b) The review's results must be reported to supervisors for them to review:

"Initial evaluation of the faculty member's performance may be carried out by the department, department chair (or equivalent), dean, or peer review committee, but in any event must be reported to the chair (or equivalent) and dean for review." (RR [31102](#))

- c) CPR must include peers as part of the review process:

"Comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall include peer review. The members of peer review committees shall include representatives of the college/school or department". (RR [31102](#))

4. Purpose

- a) Comprehensive periodic review of tenured faculty is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom through a positive, thorough, fair, and transparent process.
- b) The functional purpose of Comprehensive Periodic Review is to:
 - provide guidance for continuing and meaningful tenured faculty development,
 - assist faculty with enhancing professional skills and goals,
 - refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate,
 - provide assurance that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to their program, college/school, the University, and the State of Texas,
 - assess whether the individual is making a professional contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member of the relevant rank and role,
 - assess promotion trajectory, where relevant, and
 - form a basis for determining merit raises, honors, awards, endowment appointments, and other types of recognition.

5. The Review

- a) **Schedule for Reviews.** Comprehensive Periodic Reviews (CPRs) will be completed for each tenured faculty member no more often than once every year and ***no less often than once every six years***. The review may not be waived for any tenured faculty member.
 - i. **Notice of Review.** Reasonable notice of intent to review will be provided to the faculty member being reviewed no less than six months before the start of the CPR.
 - ii. **CPR Deferral.** A CPR may only be deferred when:
 - the tenured faculty member is on an approved personal leave without pay (full- or part-time) for medical reasons during the time when the CPR is being conducted,
 - the tenured faculty member is continuously using sick time off (full- or part-time) for one whole semester during the academic year when the CPR is being conducted.

When circumstances warrant a deferral request, the request must be submitted by the department chair or supervisor via the dean to the Provost's Office who will review the request for a one-year deferral. Per the [Regents' Rule 31102](#), "no deferral of review of an active (tenured) faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled (year of) review".
 - iii. **Counting Years.** At UT Austin, *except for approved personal leaves without pay (full- or part-time) for medical reasons or continuously using sick time off (full- or part-time) for one whole semester occurring during the actual CPR review year*, which prompts a CPR deferral by a year, periods when a faculty member is on leave without pay will count towards the six-year tally. Similarly, a year associated with an approved [personal circumstances](#) (PC) flag will also count towards the six-year tally. However, any year within the six-year tally that has a PC flag or during which a faculty member had an approved personal leave without pay *for medical reasons* or used sick time off for a continuous period should be identified to the review committee without including the

reason for the designation. This should prompt the CPR reviewers to reframe the review period for the faculty member. For example, if a faculty member is going through CPR and has been approved for one PC flag during the period under consideration, the peer review committee should consider the body of work as having been completed in five academic years rather than six.

- iv. **Beginning or Resetting the Start of the CPR Timeline.** A CPR timeline for a tenured faculty member is begun or reset when one of the following occurs.
- Initial appointment through the hiring process as a tenured associate professor or tenured professor at UT Austin.
 - The completion of a CPR as a tenured faculty member.
 - Successful promotion to the rank of tenured full or tenured associate professor (a default CPR rating of “exceeds expectations” is assigned).
 - Successful appointment to an endowment for which the faculty member was selected as a result of a full review (a default CPR rating of “exceeds expectations” is assigned).
 - For example, a faculty member is selected for an endowment three years after their promotion to the rank of tenured full professor. The endowment appointment selection was based on a full-scale review of the faculty member’s professional contributions. For this endowment appointment, the full-scale faculty review for the endowment selection would count as a CPR and the faculty member’s CPR timeline would be reset starting again on the first September 1st once the appointment is effective.
 - As another example, for a faculty member for whom an endowment appointment was renewed without a full-scale review of their professional contributions, that reappointment would not reset the CPR timeline.
 - Initial appointment as dean, provost, or president.
 - Initial appointment as a half-time or more Administrator after a competitive search.
 - The provost will determine whether the search counts as “competitive”. The unit must request this approval to reset the CPR timeline.
 - For tenured faculty Administrators whose administrative appointment is reviewed every sixth year, the Comprehensive Periodic Review should be scheduled in the same year as the administrative appointment performance review and the two evaluations consolidated to the greatest extent possible.
 - For Administrators whose administrative appointment is reviewed earlier than the sixth year (e.g., in the fourth year), the Comprehensive Periodic Review can be scheduled at the same time and coordinated with the Administrator review if the Administrator’s supervisor so chooses.
 - If a candidate for promotion to tenured full professor is unsuccessful then the promotion review does not count as a CPR.
 - In the rare event that the timing of the unsuccessful promotion review coincides with when a CPR must be completed, the candidate’s dean must ensure that a CPR is completed in accordance with the process outlined in the CPR Following an Unsuccessful Promotion Review section below [see section 5.g)].

- If the unsuccessful promotion review does not coincide with the timing of a required CPR, then the dean may still choose to complete one in accordance with the process outlined in the CPR Following an Unsuccessful Promotion Review section [section 5.g)].
 - If a faculty member's annual review performance is rated as unsatisfactory in two consecutive academic years, then the supervisor, in consultation with the dean or provost, must schedule a CPR to be completed in the following academic year.
- v. **Deadline for CPR Completion.** The deadline for full completion of a CPR review is **June 15th** of the academic year that the CPR is begun (unless a deferral is approved – see the Deferral section above). And a CPR must be completed within each six academic years period for tenured faculty. The “fully completed CPR review” deadline of June 15th must include final review by any additional intensive review committee (see Review details below). In addition,
- The **final** overall CPR rating category (i.e., exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory - see more below) and ratings for each area of specialization is due to the Provost's Office by June 15th of the sixth year, and
 - Each CSU should establish a deadline with a date earlier than June 15th by which time each CPR committee's rating category and report is due to the dean to allow time for an additional intensive review if needed (see below).
- vi. **Example Timelines.** Three example timelines are provided below. The example timelines use fixed years for illustrative purposes only and are not updated annually.
1. For a faculty member with no CPR deferral and who is either promoted or hired into a tenured faculty position effective by September 1st, 2019, their CPR must be completed by June 15th, 2025:

Year Count	Academic Year	Activity
1	2019-20	Promoted or hired into tenured position effective by September 1 st of this academic year
2	2020-21	
3	2021-22	
4	2022-23	
5	2023-24	
6	2024-25	CPR review conducted and CPR rating due no later than June 15 th , 2025

2. As another example, for a tenured faculty member without any deferral and for whom a CPR had been completed in the 2019-20 academic year, the CPR must be completed by June 15th, 2026:

Year Count	Academic Year	Activity
	2019-20	CPR completed
1	2020-21	
2	2021-22	
3	2022-23	
4	2023-24	
5	2024-25	
6	2025-26	CPR Review conducted and CPR rating due no later than June 15 th , 2026

3. As another example, for a tenured faculty member with a deferral for an approved medical leave without pay during what should have been their sixth year since completing a CPR in the 2019-20 academic year, the CPR must be completed by June 15th, 2027:

Year Count	Academic Year	Activity
	2019-20	CPR completed
1	2020-21	
2	2021-22	
3	2022-23	
4	2023-24	
5	2024-25	
N/A	2025-26	Deferral requested and approved due to medical leave without pay
6	2026-27	CPR Review conducted and CPR rating due no later than June 15 th , 2027

- b) **Peer Review Committee.** Comprehensive Periodic Review of tenured faculty must entail peer review. At UT Austin, voting members of the committee must include tenured full professors and the peer committee must consist of at least three tenured full professors. If the faculty member holds a joint appointment, then composition of the committee must be agreed upon by the supervisors and dean(s) of the joint units of the faculty's appointment. The members of the peer review committees must include representatives of the college/school or department and will be appointed, based on their objectivity and academic strength, by the dean and supervisor in consultation with tenured faculty from the faculty member's college/school. For all candidates under review, results of the initial review must be reported to the department chair (if relevant), the supervisor of the faculty member's administrative position (if relevant), and dean of the college or school hosting their primary academic appointment for additional review and comment. Slight distinctions in the review committee membership selection as a function of the faculty member's role(s) during their CPR period are specified below:
- i. **For Tenured Faculty who are Not Administrators.** For faculty who do not or did not hold an appointment as an Administrator during their CPR review period, the initial review may be carried out by a faculty committee including eligible members of the unit's faculty governance committee (budget council or executive committee) in the unit(s) of the faculty member's primary appointment.
 - ii. **For Tenured Faculty Administrators.** Depending on whether the faculty member is still serving as an Administrator, the process will be overseen as follows:
 1. For faculty who are **currently serving** as Administrators with their appointment already having lasted over one academic year, members of the peer review committee should be appointed by the supervisor of the faculty member's administrative role. If the administrative role is not or was not full-time then the administrative supervisor should appoint committee members in collaboration with the supervisor (e.g., chair or dean) of the faculty member's primary academic unit. If the supervisor is not a tenured faculty member, then the members of the peer review committee should be selected by the dean or provost or their delegate. If the appointment has been in effect for less than one academic year, then the review follows the guidelines laid out for Tenured Faculty who are Not Administrators which is described above.
 2. For faculty **who served** (and are no longer serving) as an Administrator for at least one full academic year during the CPR review period, members of the peer review committee should be appointed by the current or former supervisor of the administrative role in collaboration with the supervisor of the faculty member's primary appointment. The peer review committee (whether the faculty member has completed their administrative role or not) must include at least one tenured full professor from the unit of their primary faculty appointment (e.g., department, college, or school) as well as at least one tenured full professor who is a peer Administrator appointed by the supervisor of the faculty member's administrative position. If the supervisor of the current or former administrative appointment no longer serves in that role, then the faculty member's current supervisor should consult with the dean and Provost's Office

to determine how to identify the relevant supervisors to involve in the CPR.

- c) **Responsibilities Reviewed¹**. The evaluation will include review of the faculty member's potential for continuing excellence based on their professional contributions and the impact of the work that they have accomplished during the CPR review period.
- i. **For Tenured Faculty who are not Administrators**. For faculty who do not or did not hold an administrative appointment during their CPR review period, the review should focus on the faculty members' contributions in each of the following areas of specialization:
 - Teaching,
 - Research and creative endeavors,
 - Mentoring,
 - Service, and
 - When applicable, patient care, and administration.
 - ii. **For Tenured Faculty who are or were Administrators in the CPR period**. For faculty appointed who served as Administrators for at least one academic year during their CPR review period, the review should focus on the faculty members' contribution in the relevant area(s) of specialization of those listed below:
 - Teaching,
 - Research and creative endeavors,
 - Mentoring,
 - Service, and
 - When applicable, patient care, and administration.

The review of contributions in the relevant area(s) of specialization should consider the workload re-distribution proportional to their administrative and tenured faculty member roles and associated expectations. The supervisor of the administrative position should share information with the review committee about the faculty candidate's percentage of appointment during the CPR period.
- d) **Materials Submitted**. The faculty member being evaluated must submit or arrange for submission of the following materials to be reviewed:
- A current curriculum vitae (accomplishments achieved during the CPR review period may be highlighted),
 - A summary statement of professional accomplishments across the relevant areas of specialization,
 - Annual review reports from each year during the CPR review period,
 - Course instructor / evaluation survey report results including **all student comments** for each completed semester of each year (including the summer session where relevant) during the CPR review period (if relevant),
 - Any peer teaching observations conducted during the CPR review period (if relevant), and
 - Any other materials identified by the college/school/department/unit.

The faculty member may also provide copies of:

- A statement of professional goals,

¹ Responsibilities Reviewed for faculty appointed in the Dell Medical School will be pursuant to the School's faculty evaluation policies.

- A proposed professional development plan, and/or
- Any additional professional materials that the faculty member deems appropriate. For example, faculty members performing substantial duties in other departments or programs should provide information describing the extent and impact of that work.

If the faculty member does not submit the required materials for their CPR, the review committee and supervisor(s) must still conduct the review, based on the evidence that is available.

- e) **Review.** The review committee and supervisor(s) must review all materials submitted by the candidate and create a written report that includes a holistic rating category (using one of the four rating categories listed below):
- Categories.** Each faculty member being reviewed must be given an overall rating using one of the following rating categories:
 - ***Exceeds expectations*** – a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal, or
 - ***Meets expectations*** – normally expected level of accomplishment, or
 - ***Does not meet expectations*** - a failure in accomplishments beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be correctable, or
 - ***Unsatisfactory*** – failing to meet expectations in a way that reflects disregard of previous feedback or other efforts to provide correction, development, or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. Information is provided below about next steps for any faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory rating.

Expectations should be evaluated relative to standards aligned with the faculty member's rank, discipline, department or unit, and role (e.g., part- or full-time administrative appointment). The overall rating should result from a holistic review and overall judgment of the faculty member's professional contributions, impact, and potential for continuing excellence. A justification must be provided if the overall CPR rating differs from the average ratings from the annual reviews during the review period.

In addition to the required single holistic rating, the committee must provide a rating for each of the relevant area(s) of specialization. This helps with offering opportunities for recognition and areas of focus for development and improvement.

ii. **Committee Review.**

The committee's written report shall advise the faculty member of areas of excellence and highlight any specific areas (e.g., research, teaching, service, and/or mentoring) that need improvement and opportunities that might support positive development. The committee's written report shall contain sufficient information to contextualize the basis for the overall rating as well as the rating in each of the area(s) of specialization. For associate professors being reviewed, the report should also comment on and offer any suggestions about the candidate's progress toward promotion to the rank of tenured full professor.

iii. **Supervisors' Review.**

The committee's evaluation is shared with the faculty member's supervisors (e.g., department chair, dean, supervisor of the administrative appointment).

- A supervisor may request additional information or ask the faculty review committee to reassess all or portions of the review.
- If the supervisor agrees with the committee's evaluation, then they do not have to provide a separate evaluation statement, although they can provide additional feedback and suggestions for recognition and development as needed.
- If a supervisor disagrees with the committee's evaluation, then the supervisor should prepare a separate evaluation statement that indicates the different rating category and clearly articulates the basis for disagreement with the faculty committee's review.
- If the dean or *Administrative Supervisor* (of a faculty member who has served or is serving in an administrative role – e.g., provost, senior vice provost, vice president) disagrees with the committee's or department chair's evaluation, then the dean or *Administrative Supervisor* may choose to request an Additional Intensive Review (see below) if they determine that one is needed.

Results of the supervisor's review must be submitted to the dean or *Administrative Supervisor* and faculty member well before the June 15th, deadline to allow time for the dean or *Administrative Supervisor* to request additional information and/or oversee additional review before the final review is due to the Provost's Office no later than June 15th. **The reviews conducted by any CSU committees are advisory to the dean or *Administrative Supervisor*.**

If the faculty candidate has been sanctioned for misconduct during the CPR period, the supervisor must reach out to the provost's [Faculty Affairs team](#) for guidance on how the information might be included in the review.

iv. **Additional Intensive Review**

- A more intensive review may be initiated for a faculty member if
 - the dean or *Administrative Supervisor* determines that it is needed, or if
 - the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in any area of specialization, or as the overall rating, and the faculty member requests a more intensive review.
- An additional intensive comprehensive review committee shall be appointed by the dean or *Administrative Supervisor* no later than **April 15th**.
- Before submitting its final evaluation report to the faculty member's dean or *Administrative Supervisor*, the review committee must notify the faculty member of the results of the review and provide them with an opportunity to meet with the committee, submit additional material, and comment on the committee's findings.
- The membership of the committee shall include at least three tenured full professors.
- **For Tenured Faculty who are Not Administrators.** For faculty who do not or did not hold an administrative appointment during their CPR review period, the additional intensive review committee must include tenured full

professors from the college or school of the faculty member's primary appointment.

- **For Tenured Faculty Administrators.** For faculty who are **currently serving or who served** as Administrators for at least one full academic year during the CPR review period, the additional intensive review committee must include at least one tenured full professor from the college or school of the faculty member's primary appointment and at least one peer Administrator who is familiar with the faculty member's administrative role.
 - **Additional Intensive Review (AIR) Materials.** The AIR committee may request additional information from the faculty member under review. Upon their request, the faculty member will be provided with the opportunity to meet with the AIR committee.
 - **AIR Committee Review Deadline.** The result of the AIR committee's evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member and to the department chair and dean and *Administrative Supervisor* (if relevant) no later than **June 15th** for appropriate administrative action, if any.
- f) **Faculty Meeting with Review Committee(s).** Before submitting an evaluation report to the faculty member's supervisor(s), the review committee must notify the faculty member of the results of their review and provide the faculty member with an opportunity to meet with the committee, to submit additional material, and to comment on the committee's findings. Written comments submitted by the faculty member must be included with the final evaluation report submitted to the supervisor(s).
- g) **CPR Following an Unsuccessful Promotion Review.**
In cases where a tenured associate professor undergoes a promotion review to full professor and is not promoted, and the timing of that review coincides with their scheduled CPR, the faculty member must still undergo a CPR during that academic year. If a CPR is not required in that academic year, the dean may choose to initiate one based on the outcome of the promotion review. In either case, the procedures outlined below define how the CPR should be conducted.
- **No separate peer review committee is required.** Because the promotion review consisted of at least five full professors, the CPR does not need to be conducted by a new three-member tenured faculty committee. Instead, the dean, who has reviewed the full promotion file and participated in feedback discussions with the President's Promotion and Tenure Committee, must prepare a brief CPR report.
 - The CPR report must include:
 - A holistic rating of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory, per section 5.e.i. above,
 - Ratings for each of the four areas of review (research, teaching, service, and mentoring) per section 5.e.i. above,
 - Feedback that is not already included in the formal promotion review dossier (particularly feedback that is not reflected in the chair or dean letters),
 - A brief addendum from the dean outlining expectations and areas of focus for future promotion consideration. This may be developed in consultation with the department chair (if relevant).
 - Communication and use of results follow typical handling of CPR ratings and report.

- This process is distinct from the Additional Intensive Review requirement and should not be treated as such unless additional concerns independent of promotion outcome warrant further review.

6. Communication and Use of Results

- The ratings resulting from reviews conducted by any CSU committee and supervisor (e.g., department chair) are advisory to the dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor's* (if applicable) ratings. The dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor* determines the final overall rating and the rating for each area of specialization for the candidate.
- Results of the evaluations will be communicated in writing to the faculty member, the department chair (where relevant), dean, *Administrative Supervisor* and the provost for review and appropriate action. The faculty member may provide a written response to each evaluation, which will be added to the official record.
- Comprehensive Periodic Review results can be used to inform salary and merit recommendations, appointment opportunities, nomination for awards and endowments, or other forms of performance recognition.
- Faculty members, regardless of review category, whose performance in one or more areas of specialization indicates they would benefit from assistance may be placed by a department chair or dean on a development support plan and referred to available institutional support, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, professional coaching, or mentoring in research, etc. Establishing a development support plan is not a disciplinary action. It is an instrument for committing to specific professional development goals and strategies for the upcoming year.
 - It is critical that any professional development plan must clearly lay out benchmarks to facilitate assessment that the faculty member has met the expectations laid out in the plan because, as required in required by Texas Education Code Section [51.942](#), UT's policy must

"allow for the dismissal of a tenured faculty member at any time after providing the faculty member with appropriate due process, on a determination that... the faculty member has... failed to successfully complete any post-tenure review (CPR) professional development program".
 - If there is insufficient improvement following the implementation of the professional development plan, the University shall take action including, if appropriate, proceeding to appropriate discipline or termination.

7. Unsatisfactory Rating

- a) If a faculty member receives a rating of "unsatisfactory" as an overall rating or for any of area of specialization, supervisors - in consultation with the provost - must provide a short-term development plan with specific performance benchmarks to be met as required in TXEC [51.942](#):

"for a faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory rating in any area of any evaluation conducted under this section, the evaluation process (must) provide for a short-term development plan that includes performance benchmarks for returning to satisfactory performance"

- b) The short-term development plan must be formulated within one month of the faculty member receiving the final written evaluation and rating. The plan:

- must include a follow-up schedule (with specific dates), benchmarks, and measurable goals for evaluating improved performance,
 - must include a deadline for the evaluation of the results that is not longer than an academic year (fall and spring semesters) from the start of the plan,
 - must indicate the University resources available to provide appropriate support for the faculty member in achieving the goals of the plan,
 - must indicate who will monitor the implementation of the plan and support the faculty member through the process (e.g., the department chair or a faculty mentor),
 - must identify who is responsible for assessing progress at the end of the timeframe allocated for the short-term development plan (e.g., department chair, dean's delegate, etc.), and
 - may include longer term goals with associated deadlines and measurable outcomes.
- c) A copy of the development plan shall be submitted to the dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor* and Provost's Office no later than August 15th.
- d) A development plan status report must be submitted to the dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor* and Provost's Office no later than August 1st after the spring semester of the following academic year.
- e) If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is identified during the CPR then appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including review for termination, may be initiated in accordance with due process procedures of the Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule [31008](#), and [HOP 2-2320](#).

8. Further Review

- a) Nothing in this document is intended to alter faculty members' rights to avail themselves of existing appeals channels, including the next higher administrative level, the Faculty Grievance Committee, Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom (CCAFR), and the Faculty Ombudsperson.
- b) A faculty member may request review for procedural irregularities or academic freedom violations by submitting a request to the CCAFR Chair. A request for review should describe the procedural irregularity being asserted and/or the alleged violation of academic freedom and how it impacted the evaluation outcome.
- c) CCAFR shall not review disputes about professional judgments concerning the merits of the faculty member's record.
- d) In its role as overseer of the faculty evaluation process, CCAFR will monitor this review process and report its findings annually, will receive and advise on such problems or issues referred to it by any member of the faculty, the provost, the president, the chancellor, or the Board of Regents, and will make whatever recommendations it considers appropriate to improve the process.

9. Schedule of Deadlines

Academic Year before CPR:

By **March 31st**: Provide at least six months' notice to faculty member of intent to conduct CPR which allows the faculty candidate up to six months to prepare their materials for submission to the review committee.

Academic Year of CPR:

By **October 1st**: Unit should provide the review committee and the faculty member with the following reports for the faculty member from each year since the start of the CPR period:

- Annual reports,
- Course instructor / evaluation survey ratings and student comments,
- Peer teaching observations (if relevant), and
- Any other materials maintained by the unit to be assessed during the CPR.

Faculty member submits their CPR materials to the committee including:

- A current CV,
- A summary statement of professional accomplishments across the relevant areas of specialization,
- A statement of professional goals (if they choose),
- Any additional professional materials that the faculty member deems appropriate.

By **February 15th**: Share initial CPR report with faculty member, allowing the faculty member to meet with the committee, to provide additional materials if they choose, and for the committee to submit the **final** version* of the initial CPR report to faculty member's supervisors (department chair, dean, *Administrative Supervisor*).

By **April 15th**: (If needed) Additional Intensive Review committee appointed by dean or *Administrative Supervisor*.

By **June 15th**: The **final** overall CPR rating category (i.e., exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory - see more below) and ratings for each area of specialization is due to the Provost's Office.

(If needed) Additional Intensive Review committee shares CPR report with faculty member, allowing the faculty member to meet with the committee, to provide additional materials if they choose, and for the committee to submit their final CPR report* to faculty member's supervisors.

By **July 15th**: Final CPR report* (including all evaluation reports and ratings) submitted by dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor* to Provost's Office.

By **August 15th**: (If needed) For a faculty member with an unsatisfactory rating, dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor* submit a final copy the development plan to the dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor* and Provost's Office.

* These deadlines are for the final versions of reports from the relevant committees. Thus, deadlines should be set earlier to allow for candidate feedback, revision by committee as needed, etc.

Academic year after CPR completed:

By **August 1st**: (If needed) Submit short-term development plan status report (if applicable) to dean and/or *Administrative Supervisor* and Provost's Office.