

TO: Thomas Boyd, Interim Provost
FROM: Faculty Senate
DATE: January 14, 2017
SUBJECT: Faculty Evaluation Concerns

There is some speculation on the value of the faculty evaluation process. The recent faculty climate survey reveals the following: ~37% of the faculty somewhat or strongly agrees the process is transparent; ~37% somewhat or strongly agrees the process is fair; ~32% somewhat or strongly agrees the criteria reflect university priorities and strategic goals; ~24% somewhat or strongly agrees the process incentivizes excellence; ~21% somewhat or strongly agrees salary increases are allocated according to performance. In light of this, we make some observations and suggestions below:

1. In some units, annual reviews have not been done in recent years, and in other units annual reviews are delayed until the summer. This suggests that some DHs, DDs, and Deans are not taking faculty evaluations seriously, or do not have adequate time built into their workloads to do this job effectively. Deans should set and enforce an evaluation schedule. The evaluation cycle might be more effective if it were moved from a calendar year review to an academic year review.
2. Many faculty believe that DHs, DDs, and Deans do not fully integrate FDR content into their annual review. A holistic annual review requires more than just raw data from an FDR. The outcomes should include a thoughtful evaluation, constructive criticism, and recognition to deserving faculty. DHs, DDs, and Deans could benefit from instruction and mentoring in these areas.
3. Many faculty do not understand how their evaluations are scored. For example, how do DHs and DDs distinguish between "Satisfactory" and "Exceeds Expectations"? Guidelines should be developed that DHs and DDs use to better inform their faculty. Additionally, the Administration should be transparent as to how Faculty Evaluations and Performance Reviews impact salaries, the raise pool, and merit increases.
4. The Faculty Handbook lists five performance ratings. Some DHs and DDs use additional descriptors such as "Satisfactory +" and "Satisfactory -". All units should use the same performance ratings.
5. Faculty Evaluations should be based on merit and performance outcomes set by individual DHs and DDs in conjunction with their respective Deans. Deans should inform and motivate their DHs and DDs to set appropriate goals for their units and faculty. These targets should be defined each year in a timely manner for each faculty member.
 - a. Faculty should be **assessed** throughout the year based on their progress towards their goals.
 - b. Faculty should be **evaluated** on their outcomes as each evaluation period concludes.

Senate respectfully requests a response by March 1, 2017.