

University Faculty Affairs Committee.

**Motion:** We propose changes to language in Section 6 “Faculty Evaluation Procedures” (see attachments with and without “track changes” from the original wording).

**History of the motion, and rationale for proposed changes:**

In May of 2018, the UFAC received a request from the Dean Keith Mellinger and CAS department chairs to examine section 6 of the Faculty Handbook and Faculty Evaluation Procedures, in particular the efficacy of merit pay, the relevancy of the APWF weighting form, as well as inconsistency in evaluation across departments. We were asked to consider in any changes we propose, the importance of these evaluations in tenure and promotion procedures, and whether or not to treat faculty at the rank of professor differently from lower ranks in annual evaluation.

Our proposal is meant to recognize the good work of the majority of our faculty, and to help guide junior faculty towards promotion and tenure. In the three areas of evaluation (teaching, professional activity, and service) we propose three rating levels that set clearer distinctions among what activities “meet expectations,” those that “exceed expectations,” and propose remediation and eventual consequences for faculty whose performance “does not meet expectations” in one or more of the areas. These three ratings in the three areas of evaluation—teaching, professional activity, and service—are the basis for an overall rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory. Under the proposed system, the APWF weighting form is no longer necessary, so it has been eliminated.

We have accepted most of the suggested edits to our draft proposal (presented to the UFC at its December meeting), especially from the provost regarding salaries and unsatisfactory performance. Additionally the state OAG’s office has gone over the proposed changes and has approved them with only small edits which we have done.

We have also considered concerns raised by Women’s and Gender Studies regarding the use of student course evaluations in annual evaluation of faculty performance. To that end we have added a statement to 6.3.1 Evaluation Criteria about implicit bias. We already stated in this section that the criteria “are not meant to be considered comprehensive and are not limited to the examples provided. It is also not expected that a particular merit score level performance rating requires that a faculty member accomplish all of the examples provided within each category, but rather show a set of achievements consistent with these descriptions.” We believe that including “a significant number of noteworthy positive scores and comments by students reported by the student course surveys” as one of many ways to show excellence in teaching increases the opportunities for faculty of color and women faculty to “Exceed expectations” in this area.

There are several issues that come up in the context of Section 6, but that in the future may need to be addressed in other sections of the handbook. First is the issue of Special Assignments in 6.4.5. We have clarified the evaluation process for faculty with special assignments. However, the fuller issue of Special Assignments, which has been brought to the committee’s attention recently by a group of faculty, is one that will probably merit an addition to the Faculty Handbook, perhaps in Section 3. The second issue is Section 4. It is referenced in 6.9.3 Unsatisfactory Performance Review. The committee may also need to review Section 4 in the future with the help of the administration. Lastly, also in 6.9.3 the original

handbook language makes reference to the role of the college Promotion and Tenure committees. However, in the descriptions of the duties of all three P&T committees, this duty is not included. We have suggested that each college consider adding the following to their list of committee duties in their respective Appendices: ""Make recommendations for faculty required to participate in Unsatisfactory Performance Review (See §6.9.3)."