

# Annual Review Policy Change Proposal

Faculty Senate Presentation

Presenter: Colin Blakely



# Annual Review Policy *need for change*

- Faculty (N=60) and Department Heads (N=12) Taskforces developed preliminary recommendations during Spring 2020
  - The process should be streamlined to reduce overall burden on Department Heads and Annual Review Committees
  - Annual reviews should be more formative and less evaluative.
  - The annual review process should be consistent across the university.
  - Ratings rather than scores should be employed in the metric. Fewer than 5 levels of rating are preferred.
  - The rigor of the process should be tiered to meet varying needs based on faculty rank.



# Annual Review Policy **DRAFT**

## **CHANGES**

- Proposed changes are consistent between both [Chapter 3.2](#) (career and tenure track) and [Chapter 4A.2](#) (continuing status track) policy.
- **Two levels of ratings for peer committee (“meets or exceeds expectations” or “does not meet expectations”)**
  - Department head provides more than one level of rating in the case of “does not meet expectations” to indicate “needs improvement or unsatisfactory”.
- **Peer committee feedback is shared with faculty member**
  - Feedback will be brief and will use a university form.
- **Fewer required annual meetings**
  - Department head will be required to meet as follows:
    - Annually for all tenure-eligible faculty, regardless of rating;
    - When the rating in any category is “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” for tenured or career-track faculty;
    - As requested by faculty members.
- **Post-tenure - college committee sends comments** to department head to ensure meeting with tenured faculty at least once every five years.