

## **Responses to Faculty Senate Inquiry Regarding Evaluation Process**

1. How many tenured faculty are currently employed at SOU?

***79 tenured faculty per AY18-19 Faculty tracking spreadsheet 080318***

2. Among tenured faculty, how many hold the rank of Associate Professor, and how many hold the rank of Full Professor?

***22 Associate Professors and 57 Full Professors per AY18-19 Faculty tracking spreadsheet 080318***

3. Among all tenured faculty, how many completed an FPAR in Spring 2018?

***75 tenured faculty submitted an FPAR through Workflow in Activity Insight.***

4. Among tenured faculty who completed an FPAR in Spring 2018, how many were flagged by the chair or division director for deficiencies in any of the following areas:
  - a. How many found the faculty member's performance in teaching was unacceptable?
  - b. How many found the faculty member's performance in the service was unacceptable?
  - c. How many found the faculty member's performance in scholarship were unacceptable?

***These items are not flagged as part of the FPAR process. The FPAR, as currently defined in the Bylaws, is a self-evaluation. Faculty rank themselves. Neither the chair or the director is empowered to evaluate a faculty member's self-rankings or overall performance. Even if they did, Chairs frequently and for a variety of reasons do not give evaluative feedback.***

5. Among all tenured faculty, how many have received a colleague evaluation in the last 5 years?

***37 tenured faculty have a colleague evaluation in AY13-14 or later per AY18-19 Faculty tracking spreadsheet 080318***

6. Among tenured faculty who have received a colleague evaluation in the last 5 years, how many of those evaluations found deficiencies requiring further review in any of the following areas:

- a. How many found the faculty member's performance in teaching was unacceptable?
- b. How many found the faculty member's performance in the service was unacceptable?
- c. How many found the faculty member's performance in scholarship were unacceptable?

***Colleague evaluation committees rarely find colleagues unacceptable even when they are clearly not meeting expectations at the acceptable level. There have been a handful of instances in the director's collective 30+ year memory, but usually only in particularly egregious situations.***

7. How many times in the past 5 years have division directors found the current evaluation process insufficient to address unacceptable faculty performance?

***As noted above, our FPAR and colleague evaluation processes do not empower chairs or directors to address problematic performance, except in the most egregious situations.***

***Specifically, the evaluation processes could be more effective in empowering chairs and directors if the following flaws could be addressed:***

- 1) ***The FPAR process does not provide for evaluation feedback from the chair or director.***

***Current issues include: (1) self-evaluations that provide little or no supporting evidence for ratings, (2) ratings that do not appear to align with program's expectations document, and sadly (3) instances when individuals claim, without remorse or plan for change, that they have done nothing in a particular area, most frequently scholarship and university service.***

- 2) ***The colleague evaluation process gives the chair a role in that evaluation, but they are only one voice on the committee. Furthermore, it does not provide for any evaluation feedback from the director in evaluating the faculty member or in evaluating the evaluation. Directors only have a role in colleague evaluations if there is an appeal that fails***

***to be resolved at the program personnel committee level or if the colleague evaluation indicates the faculty member's performance is deficient, both of which are exceptionally rare.***

***Having the ability to evaluate the evaluation would empower directors to go back to evaluation committees when evaluations are problematic. This would give committees an opportunity to improve the evaluation and provide better feedback to the faculty member and subsequent evaluation committees. Common issues are: (1) overly short or vague evaluations, (2) evaluations that do not appear to have critically weighed the evidence, and (3) evaluation ratings that don't appear to align with the program's expectations document.***

- 3) The bylaws provide criteria for promotion but do not provide guidance for continued performance standards once a faculty member has promoted.***

***In the Senate discussion, it was agreed that the intention of allowing a senior faculty member to drop below acceptable in service or scholarship was to allow them to get much more heavily involved in the other areas. This is quite different from being minimally acceptable in the other two areas. Similar to the averaging used for promotion to full, could an unacceptable in one area require averaging at least preferred in both other areas (i.e., preferred in both, or exceptional in one and acceptable or preferred in the other).***

8. If the answer to question 7 is greater than zero, please explain (without using any identifying information about your division or the faculty members in question) why the process has been insufficient to address performance problems.