

Annual Review Policy Change Proposal

Faculty Senate Presentation
December 6, 2021



Where did the policy change originate?

- Organizational Health Index Findings (N=1,052)
 - Annual reviews were not happening
 - Annual reviews were not helpful
- Praxis Workshop Findings (N=54)
 - Annual reviews were not meaningful
 - Too much focus on scores – more focus on coaching and career conversations for faculty
 - Update guidelines and processes more frequently
- Faculty Annual Review Change Taskforce (N=60)
- Department Heads Annual Review Change Taskforce (N=12)
- **Preliminary recommendations** to Annual Review UHAP Policies 3.2 and 4A.2 during Spring 2020:



What needed to be changed?

REQUESTED

- Reduce burden on Department Heads and Annual Review Committees.
- Annual reviews should be more formative and less evaluative. 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.
- The annual review process should be consistent across the university.

PROPOSED

- Fewer required meetings.
- Share the peer review narrative. Fewer than 5 levels for ratings
- Fewer meetings with post-tenure/CS and post-tenure audit feedback added.
- Consistent across tenure-track, career-track, and continuing status.



Results of Faculty Senate Vote 4-5-2021

- 63% Approve (N=26)
- 22% Abstain (N=9)
- 15% Nay (N=6)



Feedback on 30-day review

(N=20 comments)

- 65% of comments indicate concern about how to indicate excellence without 5 levels of ratings
- 20% concern about appeal ending with Dean.
- 25% concern about mixed composition of annual review committees
- Revisions considered by
 - Committee review
 - APPC review
 - OGC review



Proposed Modifications

- Clarity on grievances through UHAP Chapter 6.
- Department Head Ratings
 - Truly Exceptional
 - Meets or Exceeds
 - Needs Improvement
 - Unsatisfactory