

# Faculty Evaluations Working Group Recommendations

## Overview

The Workgroup developed draft prototypes of the instruments to arrive at the recommendations provided below.

The recommendations that follow are organized according to the instruments used in the evaluation process:

- Activities and Goal Planning (AGP) (formerly the AOR)
- Annual Activity Report (AAR)
- Annual Evaluation Form (AEF)

## AOR/AGP

- Rename the *Agreement on Responsibilities* (AOR) document to *Activities and Goal Planning* (AGP).
  - Rationale: The language of AOR creates a rigid mindset that belies the experience of faculty. *Activities and Goal Planning* (AGP) fosters the creation of a conversation between faculty and their direct supervisor regarding the continuous professional and academic development rather than the contractual connotation of the formerly titled document.
- Align *Activities and Goal Planning*, *Annual Reports*, and *Evaluation* to be on the same calendar year schedule.
  - Rationale: In the past, the AOR was set on an academic year schedule whereas the Annual Report and Evaluation was set on a calendar year schedule. Alignment of the schedule removes the unnecessary confusion.
  - Issues to be resolved
    - When should the AGP be submitted?
    - Does aligning the schedules affect evaluations or contract renewal?
    - How often should a faculty member consult with their supervisor over the content of the AGP, especially if the AGP is to be considered a *living* document.
- Expand the AGP to include a means for specifying goals that underly the activities of the faculty member.
  - Rationale: The AGP encourages identification of measurable *stretch* goals by providing the faculty member with more control over how they are evaluated. Rather than specifying just actions (e.g., will teach *x* courses), the faculty member is also be encouraged to specify goals associated to those actions (e.g., will introduce experiential learning in *y* of the *x* course that I teach).
  - Issues to be resolved
    - Training is necessary for faculty and unit leaders (chairs/program directors) on the effective specification and evaluation of stretch goals, respectively.
- The AGP should include *Expectations of Position and Rank* to capture goals, activities, and expectations that evaluators deem important for the position and rank to which a faculty member holds.
  - Rationale: The unit leaders should work with faculty to identify expectations relevant to the position of the faculty member that go beyond the goals specified.

- Align goals specified in the AGP with *personal, unit, college, or university* strategic, tactical, or operational goals
  - Rationale: Identifying how a goal relates to personal, unit, college, or university goals helps create a narrative over how what a faculty member accomplishes is related to the overall mission of the communities in which they are a member.
  - Issues to be resolved
    - Units, colleges, and the university must be more explicit about goals. This may require training.

#### *Annual Activity Report (AAR)*

- The Annual Activity Report (AAR) should be put into a digital form that is tailored to the needs of individual colleges and units
  - Rationale: The elements of reporting that individual colleges and units require differ across the university. As such, special care that the items being captured in the new *Faculty Success/Digital Measures* system are properly vetted by appropriate stakeholders.
  - Issues: While the implementation of Faculty Success is underway, special thought should be placed on how the system is rolled out. It will be for both Promotion and Tenure as well as Annual Evaluations.
- The AAR should include space for self-evaluation, self-evaluation narratives, and capture of the content needed for the AT1 form used for promotion and tenure.
  - Rationale: Whether the self-evaluation is contained in the AAR or as part of the evaluation form is secondary to whether the faculty member should engage in self-evaluation. The aim of the self-evaluation is to identify disconnects over a faculty member's perception of development versus the view of the supervisor evaluating the faculty member.

#### *Annual Evaluation (AEF)*

- The Annual Evaluation Form (AEF) should include a self-evaluation
  - Rationale: see above
  - Issues: Faculty must be trained on how to conduct a self-evaluation
- The AEF rating scale should be modified to use the following language:
  - Exemplary, Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, Unacceptable
  - Rationale: The former language (Outstanding, High, Good, Acceptable, Unacceptable) leads to connotations of performance that are counter to written or spoken descriptions of performance (e.g., "Professor X is a 'good' faculty member" or 'did a good job this year')
- The ratings scale should provide a means for finer-grained evaluation. A +/- system is recommended.
  - Rationale: The 5-level scale is too coarse-grained to be able to create differentiation in the evaluation of units
- The AEF should include a category of *Expectations of Position and Rank* to capture goals, activities, and expectations that evaluators deem important for the position and rank to which a faculty member holds.
  - Rationale: Evaluators need a means for evaluating faculty on the standard activities for a faculty member

- The AEF should include a category of *Professionalism* to capture aspects of performance that are missed by metrics-based goals measurement.
  - Rationale: While this may have been perceived as “collegiality” in the past, the evaluation of professionalism goes beyond whether a faculty member fits into the culture of the department. This category allows an evaluator to capture matters such as attendance in faculty meetings, promptness of completion of tasks, etc.

#### *Other Issues*

- What should the timeline of evaluation be?
- How do we develop rubrics within a unit to do a fair and effective evaluation of all of our faculty?
- How do faculty evaluations get linked to compensation?
- What are the guidelines for achieving differentiation within a unit? Must we really set a standard of rating 50% of faculty as “Meets Expectations” or below?