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