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Dear Dr. Slosar:

We have revised our resolution on faculty and administrator evaluations based on comments from Senators at the December meeting. We acknowledge and support Father Biondi’s most recent statement in the January message to faculty about the requirement for a written performance evaluation to be personally reviewed between employee and supervisor, however, we feel that this attached resolution is needed to show Faculty Senate support for vigorous implementation of an evaluation that follows documented criteria. We also feel the continued need to systematize evaluations of administrators. We realize that several Schools within the university currently have annual written evaluation processes that follow documented criteria and we do not advocate “one-size” fits all approach to faculty evaluations. Please refer to page three of this memo for recommendations on improving faculty evaluations and involvement in administration evaluations. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution II: THE FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY VIGOROUSLY ENFORCE AN ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW BASED ON DOCUMENTED CRITERIA DEVELOPED IN EACH SCHOOL. THESE EVALUATIONS SHOULD SERVE AS THE PRIMARY MEANS FOR DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION. THE FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDS THAT SYSTEMATIC, AND PERIODIC EVALUATIONS OF DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRS AND SCHOOL DEANS BY FACULTY OF EACH SCHOOL BE IMPLEMENTED ACCORDING TO THE FACULTY MANUAL.
RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PERTAINING TO THE RESOLUTION ON FACULTY EVALUATIONS

The Committee’s unanimous recommendations for improving faculty evaluations and involvement in administration evaluations are:

A. The faculty manual states that faculty should have an annual review based on specific criteria. However, not all Schools within the University provide fair and equitable evaluations. Faculty evaluations should be more objective with clear criteria for faculty performance. Faculty evaluations should also be interactive, where weighting of specific criteria (such as teaching, advising, research, and service) could be negotiated within a School or within a Department. The reward system should be linked to an equitable evaluation of faculty. It should also be more uniform and consistent in all schools with the aim of truly improving faculty opportunities and performance.

B. The faculty manual states that faculty have the right to participate in the selection and evaluation of administrators, however, adequate systems have not been set up to ensure that this is done uniformly throughout the university. The Dean of each School should develop a system whereby faculty, as part of the responsibilities and privileges of shared governance, periodically evaluate the performance of each Departmental Chair and vote on the continuation of a person as Chair. The Academic Provost in conjunction with faculty should assess the performance of their Dean at specifically defined intervals. Faculty votes should then be solicited on the continuity of the Dean in that position.

C. Adequate institutional and benchmarking data should be made available for the faculty including but not limited to annual review evaluation methods, salary, and benefits.
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