Annual Faculty Evaluations

Current Process (shared responsibility):

1. Faculty members complete Faculty Report of Professional Activities
2. Data tables provided to departments by ADA
3. Differentiated target averages set by Dean
4. Department chairs/committees perform evaluations:
   → Quantitative ratings (0-5) in teaching, research & service
5. Dean/ADE/ADR review ratings & recommend adjustments
6. Dean/ADE/ADR meet with each chair to finalize ratings
7. General-merit and career-merit raises set by college-wide algorithm based on performance ratings
8. Chairs and Dean add any special merit, and then overall evaluation and raise information sent to Provost
9. Evaluation forms with ratings generated by Dean’s office, chairs add comments, and then faculty member signs
10. Raises approved by Regents, then amount communicated to each faculty member
Pros and Cons of Current Process

Pros

• Thorough, multi-level process
• Objective vs. subjective
• Differential, merit-based raises
• Built-in process to address inequities

Cons

• Discipline-based differences not fully appreciated
• Quantitative vs. qualitative
• Too fine-grained (and time-consuming)
• Some faculty want more communication about performance, improvement, and process
Possible Alternative processes

Fully Localized Process without Differentiation:
- Non-differentiated raise pool passed on to each department
- Each department establishes its own system for evaluations & raises
- No review by the deans

Localized Process with Differentiation:
- Same as above except differentiated % raise pool for each department

Modified Process with Shared Responsibility:
- Qualitative vs. quantitative rating system
  → below, meets, exceeds, or far exceeds expectations, +/-?
- Primary responsibility for evaluations resides with departments
- Dean-level oversight still required for consistency, but should be simpler
- Evaluation form with more narrative on performance & plans, and allow for faculty comment
1. What information do you recommend be included in a performance and planning narrative for each faculty member? Will department chairs or personnel committees take the necessary time to prepare these narratives?

2. To map merit raises to evaluations, consider two possibilities:
   
   A. Assign a range for each ratings category, e.g., 0.5-1.5% for “meets expectations”, 1.5-2.5% for “exceeds expectations”, and 2.5-3.5% for “far exceeds expectations”, and allow the chairs and personnel committees to distribute the department’s raise pool accordingly.

   B. Assign a percentage for each sub-category, e.g., 1.7% for exceeds –, 2.0% for exceeds, and 2.3% for exceeds +, and include + and – scores as part of the overall evaluations.

   Do you have a preference of these two possibilities, and why?