

**Faculty Senate Faculty Red Committee Report**  
**Charge: Study the faculty annual evaluation tool**  
**(Dr. Tatsushi Hirono, Chair of the Faculty Red Committee):**

The Faculty Red Committee (the Committee) of the APSU Faculty Senate, at the behest of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and with input from faculty, administration, and Faculty Senate Executive Committee, has examined the process of the annual faculty evaluation. It is the Committee's finding that the process of the annual faculty evaluation is, on the whole, sound. The Committee does, however, have suggested improvements on the process.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Ensuring that faculty, chairs, and deans review Policy 2:053 Annual Faculty Evaluation Review annually.** Many of the concerns that the Committee heard from both faculty and the Executive Committee are already addressed in the existing policy (2:053).

Specifically:

- a. That faculty supply an up-to-date CV and a summary of activities in the areas of Academic Assignment & Advising, Scholarly & Creative Activities, and Service (thus aligning with the existing areas from the RTP process as well as the annual faculty evaluation instrument);
  - b. That pre-tenure faculty be allowed to use the 1-page summary of these areas from their most recent Dossier as evidence if they wish;
  - c. That department chairs are meeting individually with faculty and providing them with a copy of their evaluation;
  - d. That chairs and faculty are informed of the appeals process.
2. **Creation of department-specific annual faculty evaluation guidelines by all academic departments** that at minimum:
    - a. Define the criteria that constitute a rating of 3 in each of the evaluation areas for that department;
    - b. Include the statement "Every tenured professor is encouraged to write, publish and/or produce peer reviewed materials or professional work at least every three years."

Criteria should be drafted collaboratively with the department faculty and chair.

Deans should review departmental criteria to ensure that criteria are broadly similar across a College. This will effect standardization of the evaluation within each department – as this is the relevant unit when annual faculty evaluations are used for merit pay increases, this level of standardization makes the most sense.

3. **Changes to the evaluation tool.** The Committee was asked to consider possible changes to the evaluation tool itself.

- a. The Committee recommends that the optional self-evaluation be in a form of the faculty member's choosing, limited to 2 pages, and that it be supplied to the Chair prior to the evaluation meeting. Current policy uses the standard evaluation form (minus the Overall Composite Rating, or OCR) and is brought by the faculty member to their meeting with the chair.
  - b. Since the OCR is linked to eligibility for performance and merit-based pay increases, the performance/merit criteria currently in the box with the OCR score should be moved to the top of the form prior to Section I. This will additionally help faculty understand the annual faculty evaluation process as distinct from the RTP process.
  - c. The Committee recommends that a greater distinction be made between the terms "performance" and "merit" on the form. Either "across-the-board" or "cost of living" would be more clear.
4. **Consideration of the evaluation period and evaluation calendar.** The Committee was asked to consider potential changes to the period of evaluation (calendar year vs. academic year) as well as the calendar for evaluations (fall vs. spring). **The Committee recommends no changes to these schedules** because:
- a. When annual evaluations are used within a department for merit pay increases, those increases apply to both faculty and staff. The staff annual evaluation cycle has long been on a calendar year with evaluations happening in January or February of the following year. If a change in the calendar were instituted for faculty, a change for staff would also be needed.
  - b. Moving the entire process to fall would cause all annual evaluations as well as the RTP process to fall on faculty, staff, and chairs at the busiest time of year.
  - c. Moving the evaluation period to the academic year but keeping the evaluation calendar as it is would lead to increased confusion on the part of faculty as to what productivity items should be included.
5. **The Committee recommends a rolling 3-year average OCR score for merit-based pay increases.** Each annual faculty evaluation remains an evaluation over a single calendar year, but merit-based salary increases would be made on the basis of the average of the last three OCR scores. This will alleviate the issue encountered when a faculty member has a very strong year when no merit increases are available, but a poor year when they are. This would require a similar change for staff evaluations.

Should Faculty Senate feel that more substantial changes are needed, the Committee recommends that the aid of an Industrial-Organizational psychologist who specializes in employee assessment be enlisted.