Report of the Senate *ad hoc* committee on the Department Evaluation Committee forms for all Faculty

**Committee members**
Missy Alexander, Dean, MSAS  
Stacey Alba Hawkins, World Languages and Literatures, MSAS  
Jeff Schlicht, Health Promotion and Exercise Sciences, SPS

**Proposal**
To combine the Faculty DEC and the Professional Assessment forms into one document that also includes an option to allow tenured faculty applying for promotion to count that application as their next professional assessment.

**Rationale**
This change is motivated by the following regular errors or points of confusion during evaluation processes:

- DEC members choose the wrong form and have to back track to find the correct one, rushing around for new signatures, etc.
- DEC members use the wrong terminology (recommend vs. highly recommend) or forget to put in their summary recommendations all together.
- Candidates for promotion have no clear process for requesting that the DEC report be counted toward their next professional assessment. This leads to confusion and duplication of efforts.
- Some DECs forget to attach a separate evaluation to the form.

**Evaluation**
Upon review of the forms it is clear that the criteria for evaluation are the same in every case. There are inconsistencies in evaluation language. In addition, the use of promotion to substitute for the next professional assessment is an informal arrangement that needs codification.

**Recommendations**
- Eliminate the two existing forms and use the one developed that draws together all options. This will eliminate problem 1 above and will improve the consistency of the application of the terminology because there are now boxes to be checked.
- Use direct contract language to address the evaluation process, rather than the abridged version on the existing DEC form. Insert a reference to the contract language for Professional Assessment which is the same.
- Ask all committees to attach the narrative of the evaluation to DEC form, rather than trying to fit the narrative into the boxes on the form.
To be resolved: While the narrative in the faculty handbook makes no reference to terms for evaluation, the DEC (and the P&T) documents do. Two inconsistencies to be resolved are:

1. For non-tenure renewal the existing DEC form uses the following categories for overall ratings: satisfactory, marginal, unsatisfactory. For Professional Assessment there is only satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Should these ratings be the same for both? If so, which should be edited? Should there be any language in the faculty handbook on what these evaluations mean?

2. The ad hoc committees recommends that the following language be added to the document:
   *The DEC must attach their evaluation report to this document. Reports should specifically address each standard. It is recommended that a copy of your departmental evaluation criteria also be attached.*

Two forms have been submitted for your review. The first standardizes the language for professional assessment and non-tenured renewal. The second creates separate categories for these. Both forms included the contract language, options, and additional language on what to include.

Respectfully submitted,

Missy Alexander
Alba Hawkins
Jeff Schlicht
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