**Faculty Annual Review in 2020-21 and**

**COVID Impact Statements**

Each department/college/school has an established practice/process for completing annual review of faculty. The Provost’s Office publishes [Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty](https://utexas.app.box.com/v/annualreviews) each spring semester. Per the Guidelines, all active faculty members, tenured and non-tenured, must be evaluated annually with the following exceptions:

* faculty who are on approved, non-academic leave without pay for the entire academic year under review,
* tenured faculty who are undergoing a six-year comprehensive review,
* faculty who are 100% in an administrative position, and
* non-tenure track faculty who are assigned less than 50% time for the review period.

Departments/colleges/schools may determine the time period that is considered during an annual review. For example, some departments use a sliding average by including two prior years of performance along with the most recent year in their annual review.

Departments/colleges/schools might consider the following recommendations for the **2020-21** **annual review** process:

1. Do not assume that all faculty work has been affected in the same way since March, 2020.
2. Give faculty members the option of submitting a *COVID Impact Statement* (further described below) to provide context on the way their work has been and will be impacted by the pandemic’s effect on the faculty member’s work. Each CSU should choose whether they will request *COVID Impact Statement*s and whether they are optional and for which faculty. For CSUs who are requesting *COVID Impact Statement*s:
   1. If you allow faculty to opt out of submitting a *COVID Impact Statement* then clarify to both candidates and review committees the inferences that will be made about not including a *COVID Impact Statement* (e.g., work has not been unduly impacted).
   2. Clarify how review committee members should use the *COVID Impact Statement* to inform their review.
3. Inform annual review committees that the University’s response to COVID’s impact on faculty cannot be to change standards for review. Instead, holistic review should be informed by evidence identifying how performance and productivity has been impacted (see examples below). And, as always, the review should assess each candidate’s future potential trajectory based on performance before COVID’s professional impact along with the candidate’s plans to redress any disruption to performance that resulted from COVID’s impact on workload and its balancing.
4. Consider expanding the period of annual review to entail a sliding average that includes additional prior years’ contributions and performance.
5. Instruct review committees to very carefully interpret Course Instructor Survey (CIS) results from spring, 2020, in light of the multiple disruptions including the rapid move to online instruction for both faculty and students.
6. Use the annual review process as an opportunity
   1. to identify faculty who are struggling and find ways to offer them access to resources [e.g., mentor(s)] to support their future professional development, and also
   2. to notice the faculty who are finding ways to thrive professionally to acknowledge their performance and contributions.
7. Consider setting aside an additional review criterion to reward contributions that are less frequently directly acknowledged and that were essential but perhaps less visible to move the program / department / institution, etc. forward during the pandemic (e.g., contributions to mentoring, support / care / training of colleagues and students; teaching).

***COVID Impact Statements***

For CSUs considering use of *COVID Impact Statements*, many of the recommendations listed above around implementation and use of these *Statements* apply for all types of faculty review including the importance of clarifying whether the *Statements* are optional and how to interpret if a faculty member does not offer a *Statement*; specifying the audience for (what levels of review will evaluate) the *Statement*; making clear with review committees how to use the *Statements* in faculty evaluations; and most importantly highlighting and illustrating what can and cannot be included in the *Statements*.

**Promotion and Tenure and other Periodic Reviews**

The AY2020-21 Provost’s Office’s [General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure](https://utexas.app.box.com/file/653950150116) currently mentions consideration of the pandemic’s impact on CIS ratings as well as its potential disruption of scholarly productivity and products and creative performance. Future versions of the General Guidelines will include guidance for candidates to highlight the specifics of COVID’s impact in the statements associated with each area of specialization (e.g., research, teaching, service, etc). External reviewer solicitation letter templates will be updated to include a reminder about considering COVID’s impact.

In addition, individual Colleges and Schools can decide whether and how to add additional CSU-specific guidelines for promotion and tenure, **mid-probationary** and **comprehensive periodic reviews** around inclusion of *COVID Impact Statements*. Part of the transparency needed for CSUs’ guidelines for each of these types of review around *COVID Impact Statements* includes clarification around the audience for the statements (e.g., up through which levels of review will the *Statement* be included with consideration of adding it to materials for external reviewers, and whether the statement will be included in the dossier up through the President’s promotion and tenure committee, etc.).

**Annual Review**

For annual review, faculty members should be given the option to document the professional effect of the pandemic on their work in a *COVID Impact Statement* to be added to their review materials. CSUs should decide whether this statement can be included and how and whether it is required of faculty members being reviewed or whether it is completely optional.

The purpose of the *COVID Impact Statement* is to provide reviewers the information that they need to perform a fair, contextualized review of the faculty member’s performance and contributions.

The *COVID Impact Statement*:

* Should **not** contain **ANY** personal information (e.g., dependent care inaccessibility challenges, personal or dependents’ health information, etc.).
* Should include time period (**ONLY**– not the reason) for approved medical or personal leaves.
* Should describe the faculty member’s workload, performance and trajectory prior to COVID.
* Should describe the impact COVID has had on workload, performance and trajectory in each of the relevant areas of specialization (research and creativity, teaching, advising, service, awards).
* Should describe how the faculty member has adjusted or plans to adjust their work in light of COVID to continue or re-build their trajectory.
* Should not be longer than two pages.
* May detail different kinds of professional impact on faculty work (negative and/or positive – see below).

**Examples of Professional Impacts that might be included**

Below we offer some examples of potential professional impacts that might have disrupted faculty members’ typical workloads, workload distributions, accomplishments and performances. The *COVID Impact Statement* should highlight these impacts while explaining how the faculty member is handling and handled them and how they might redress the impact in the future.

**Teaching and Advising**

* − Moving class online might have led to negative impact in terms of re-distribution of workload away from scholarship
* − Impact on student CIS results could be contextualized given the move to online instruction
* − Invisible student care or advising support added to faculty workload
* − Faculty member covered another faculty member’s course for some period of time (which is positive in terms of service but might have diverted the work time the faculty member had for scholarship or other workload)
* + Moving class online resulted in improved pedagogical experience of some kind (e.g., increased office hours attendance, etc.)

**Research**

* − Cancelation of
  + Conference presentations / keynotes / invited talks
  + Performances
  + Exhibitions
  + Artist/scholar-in-residence appointments
* + Pivot in response to COVID led to new avenue for research and discovery
* + Scholarly expertise of relevance to pandemics led to more research opportunities and collaborations
* − Closing of labs or access to research resources (field work sites, archives and libraries, human subjects, performance space, data-gathering / collaboration travel, etc.)
* − FRA or other faculty development leave shortchanged, delayed, interrupted, etc.
* Grant funding
  + − Restricted
  + + Expanded opportunities for those in COVID-related research fields
  + − Paying students although not making expected progress in research – time spent re-defining how to achieve research objectives
* − Cancelation or delay of book contracts and publication due to book press closures or restrictions
* − Delays in publications due to reviewer inaccessibility
* − Delays in arrivals or visits of international collaborators (faculty, students, post docs)
* − Other workload foci intruded on research or creative performance time

**Service**

* Service leadership workload increased in support of staff, students, faculty (positive in terms of service although might negatively impact time available for other areas of specialization like research or teaching, etc.)
  + What level of service leadership? (program, department, CSU, institution, community, national, etc.)