E7.0 and the Annual Review Process

Kristen Waterstram-Rich, Chair
James Winebrake, Deans’ Representative
Faculty Affairs Committee (2015-16)

Overview

• Annual Review (E7.0)
  • Principles
  • Background
  • Categories
  • Elements
  • Final steps
  • Faculty development
• Questions and Uncertainties
Annual Review Principles

- Fair and transparent process to all faculty
- Flexibility and autonomy granted to departments and colleges to define expectations and criteria (consistent with tenure and promotion criteria)
- Formative process that informs merit increase decisions, tenure decisions, and promotion decisions

Annual Review Background

- Process covers all full-time faculty who are eligible for contract renewal
- Faculty assessed on teaching, scholarship, and service; weighting may be adjusted by faculty classification, rank, and individual
- Expectations are included in a faculty member’s plan of work
- Assesses January 1 – December 31; college timeline should have process completed by April 15
Annual Review Categories

- Outstanding
- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectation
- Does not meet expectations – note that this reflects deficiency beyond normal year-to-year variation in performance
- Unsatisfactory – note that this reflects repeated failure and disregard of previous reviews

Annual Review Elements

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Annual Plan of Work
- Covers contract period
- Prepared in spring
- Can be aspirational
- Approved and signed by faculty, department head, and dean
- Available to other members of unit
- Finalized after review

Self-Evaluation
- Covers review period
- Addresses plan of work and expectations
- Includes course evaluations
- Evidence of scholarly achievement
- Written confirmation of committee work

Academic Unit Head Evaluation
Annual Review Final Steps

• Teaching + Scholarship + Service = Overall
• Objective evaluation – i.e., not relative vis-à-vis performance of others
• Evaluation to include indication of progress towards promotion or tenure when appropriate
• Joint meeting between faculty member and department head required
• Faculty member can include response
• Final review signed by department head and faculty member

Faculty Development

• Faculty Improvement Fund – for tenure-track faculty rated as DNE or Unsatisfactory in teaching or scholarship; improvement plan needed.
• Faculty Education and Development (FEAD) Fund – for tenure-track faculty, senior lecturers, principal lecturers, and lecturers with multiple year contracts
  • Managed by college FEAD Committee
  • RFP process
  • Recommendations made to dean
  • Funding based on provost office distribution equation
Questions and Uncertainties

• What does a good plan of work look like and should it have aspirational components?
• Does meeting expectations in the plan of work mean that you met expectations for tenure and promotion? If not, why not?
• What is the role of peer assessment (beyond department head)?

Questions and Uncertainties

• What would we expect to be an average rating for a unit and do we need to worry about “grade inflation”?
• How does the process affect faculty morale and productivity?
• A play in one act:
  • Department head: “Please sign this review and revised plan of work.”
  • Faculty member: “No.”
Discussion