

Draft and Preliminary Report
On the "Proposed Annual Evaluation Process Model White Paper"
By Evaluation, Merit, and Workload Committee

The Evaluation, Merit, and Workload Committee met December 6, 2011 to begin reviewing the "Proposed Annual Evaluation Process Model White Paper" and proposing recommendations. The committee is in the process of gathering faculty feedback and department and college level merit, annual evaluation, and workload guidelines and will meet January 20, 2012 to continue deliberations. The following are our initial observations and recommendations.

Preliminary recommendations are:

1. The 'voluntary' faculty development plan should be removed from the 'Proposed Annual Evaluation Process Model.' The Periodic Performance Evaluation HOP Policy 2.22 and the Provost's PPE guidelines sufficiently establish the guidelines for the "Performance Improvement Plan" and the consequences of a failed improvement plan including termination. The members opposed instituting a similar policy on an annual basis.
2. The proposed guidelines should be flexible, consistent, and not prescriptive to accommodate departments that vary by size and disciplines. For example, for teaching and scholarship the white paper requires weighted scores by dimensions for teaching and scholarship and not service while the detailed table for service is difficult to score. The proposed criteria emphasis upon quantity and quality should be expanded to include the amount of time and effort invested. The faculty of each department should determine, operationalize, and approve the appropriate balance or distribution for the various dimensions of teaching, research, and scholarship.

The committee strongly supported the emphasis upon department-level and faculty governance in establishing and approving performance expectations and criteria and incorporating a faculty review process with a faculty review committee. Members agreed that the proposed faculty review committees must be comprised of elected tenure and tenure track faculty with the membership rotating 2-3 years.

The committee posed questions and concerns about the intent, purpose, and use of the white paper, the language used, and degree of detail and requirements. Committee members noted the following areas for clarification and further discussion:

1. The white paper requires a clearly stated purpose delineating how the model process is to be used i.e. "guidelines" for departments, a policy document, or a consistent and flexible annual review process. Is the intent to reward faculty achievements and performance, motivate ongoing faculty development, remediate unsatisfactory performance by negative consequences, establish policy, or provide suggestions for the annual evaluation process?
2. Terms need to be defined. The language is prescriptive, detailed, unclear, and inconsistent throughout the document, leading to confusion about what is stated. For example: the term "expectations" is used in different ways ranging from workload percentage expectations to "expectations" in relation to teaching, service, and scholarship. Language such as "will include" sets forth requirements
3. The proposed guidelines overlap with established policies and combine guidelines for annual evaluation, merit, workload, and faculty improvement of unsatisfactory performance. Because workload, annual review, and merit pay procedures are inextricably tied together, it is nearly impossible to review a faculty annual review proposal without a clear understanding and consideration of the whole.
4. The annual evaluation should emphasize the developmental process of moving toward becoming a Tier 1 University. A plan needs to be constructed to describe reasonable development towards Tier 1 that allows for annual review to parallel this progress in stages of development.