Annual Review Policy Change Proposal

Faculty Senate Presentation
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.

• Units will call for annual review information no later than 30 days before due.

• 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.
  • A diversity of faculty representation from all ranks and all tracks in the peer review committee is encouraged.

• Fewer required annual meetings
  • Department head will be required to meet as follows:
    • Annually for all tenure-eligible faculty, regardless of rating;
    • Annually for all career-track faculty who are at their initial rank (e.g. Assistant Professor, Lecturer);
    • 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.