



LETTER FROM THE PROVOST

From: Martha Pollack  
Sent: April 2, 2015  
Subject: Faculty Evaluation: Recognition of entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities

Dear Colleagues:

One of our most important responsibilities is the evaluation of faculty colleagues for tenure and promotion and as part of annual activity reporting. When carrying out this responsibility, I encourage you to give full recognition to the broad range of entrepreneurial, outreach, and creative activities in which faculty engage. These activities may enhance any of the criteria on which faculty are measured — teaching, research, and service. They may include involvement with other sectors including public and private organizations that have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations, or they may include creative activity that does not take the form of traditional scholarship.

Examples include:

- creating service learning and action-based learning opportunities for students,
- creating new instructional methods,
- engaging in community-based research,
- engaging in research funded by industrial, nonprofit, or other non-federal or foundation sources,
- creating a start-up company that enhances the broader scholarly, public service, or health care missions of the University,
- engaging in creative performance,
- creating new or enhanced practices, products, or services,
- working with to patent or license an invention,
- advising and instructing students in entrepreneurial and public service activities,
- developing collaborative approaches to solving complex world problems.

Activities like these strengthen the University and should be considered as contributions worthy of consideration, both at times of tenure and promotion and on an annual basis.

Sincerely,

Martha E. Pollack  
Provost and Executive Vice President for  
Academic Affairs

## EVALUATING FACULTY: FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW GUIDELINES



**Excellent**



**Good**



**Average**

In May 2012, a small group of senior U-M faculty drawn from several different schools and colleges, including both members of the STRIDE and FASTER committees, met for two days to discuss both their own experiences with the annual review process and literature outlining best practices, pitfalls, and recommendations. They distilled their reading and discussion into the guidelines outlined here.

## PRINCIPLES

### Fair outcomes

There should be a sense that the outcome of the annual review process (merit raise, performance score) “feels” fair to the participants, i.e., that there is an equitable distribution of resources.

### Fair and transparent processes

Participants in the annual review process should feel they have a voice and that standards are applied consistently, accurately, and without bias.

Respectful and supportive interaction. Faculty should be treated with sensitivity and respect, especially when they are being given feedback.

### Merit-based and mission-relevant review

Well articulated and transparent review criteria should be developed (ideally with input by members of the unit) based on departmental and institutional goals, vision and values.

### Developmental feedback

Reviews should assist in the guidance of junior faculty and encourage all faculty to continue to be productive and contributing scholars during their careers.

### Accountability

Faculty are responsible for timely preparation of any requested material based on their own accomplishments and, as appropriate, for conducting careful analyses of the work of others. Chairs are responsible for providing timely and well-justified analyses and recommendations to the dean and feedback to faculty in accordance with the principles outlined above.

### Service as a privilege

Evaluation of all employees, faculty included, requires many skills. Consider explicitly the characteristics that are needed in evaluators, and select evaluators with those qualities.

## PRACTICES

### Review of process

Annual review procedures and criteria should be reviewed periodically with a representative group of faculty. Are the criteria clear and mission-relevant? Have the criteria and process been well-communicated to the faculty? Do the criteria incentivize the desired behavior? Did any issues crop up in the last annual review that need to be addressed?

### Communication of goals

The goals of the annual review process, both developmental and salary-setting, should be discussed with the faculty before the process begins.

### Determination of criteria

Criteria for the annual review should be developed, discussed, and communicated before the annual process begins. An effort

should be made to create a process of evaluation that guards against shifting standards in evaluating different faculty members.

### Collection of information using a consistent template

In order to maximize the committee’s ability to use their criteria, a template should be designed that ensures uniform reporting of information for evaluation. A template that includes both specific and open-ended portions, as well as questions about goals, is recommended.

### Communication regarding the process

A timeline and materials needed from the faculty should be publicized well in advance of the due date.

### Evaluation committee

A carefully chosen committee that is inclusive and diverse should conduct the evaluation. These faculty should have a clear understanding of the evaluation review framework and criteria discussed above. Education about unconscious bias should be provided to the committee; this may be accomplished using reading materials or a presentation (e.g., from a STRIDE committee member).

### Articulation of philosophy regarding salarysetting

Salaries affect faculty recruitment and retention. They also influence what faculty do while they are here. Department chairs should develop a framework for how they will balance local (within the department) and outside market forces for salary determination and should communicate this to the faculty. Similarly, the framework should address the tradeoff between “high performers take all” and sharing rewards more broadly across the faculty.

### Developmental feedback

Developmental feedback should be provided to all faculty, but particularly to junior faculty, in a manner disconnected from the salary-setting portion of the process.

## RESOURCES

- Bauer, C. C. and B. B. Baltes (2002). “Reducing the effects of gender stereotypes on performance evaluations.” *Sex Roles* 47(9/10): 465-476.
- Curry, T. H. (2006). “Faculty performance reviews.” *Effective Practices for Academic Leaders*, 1(2): 1-16.
- Fich, F. E. (2003). “Are student evaluations of teaching fair?” *Computing Research News* 15(3): 2-10.
- Greenhaus, J. H. and S. Parasuraman (1993). “Job performance attributions and career advancement prospects: An examination of gender and race effects.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* (55): 273-297.
- Maynard, D. C., & Brooks, M. E. (2008). The persistence of stereotypes in the context of familiarity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(4), 417-419.
- Mervis, J. (2005). A Glass Ceiling for Asian Scientists? *Science*, 310(5748), 606-607.
- Russ, T., Simonds, C., & Hunt, S. (2002). Coming out in the classroom... An occupational hazard?: The influence of sexual orientation on teacher credibility and perceived student learning. *Communication Education*, 51(3), 311-324.
- Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139.
- Valian, V. (2005). Beyond gender schemas: Improving the advancement of women in academia. *Hypatia*, 20(3), 198-213.

### ADVANCE Program

1214 S. University Avenue, 2nd Floor,  
Suite C – Galleria Building  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
Phone: 734.647.9359  
Fax: 734.647.6112

[advance.umich.edu](http://advance.umich.edu)  
[advanceprogram@umich.edu](mailto:advanceprogram@umich.edu)

## TEMPLATE

The following link will take you to a sample template for an annual review reporting form which can be modified to suit the needs of different fields.

[sitemaker.umich.edu/  
advance/goodpractices](http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/goodpractices)