TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Linguistics Program

RE: Concerns about annual assessment of faculty performance

DATE: February 2, 2015

Following the most recent faculty annual performance review, the faculty of the Linguistics Program had the following concerns:

The previous system relied largely on a narrative commentary and set of recommendations from the dean. This system was recognized as necessarily subjective, but allowed for meaningful dialogue between the faculty member and his/her dean. While the new system has an appearance of greater "objectivity," in reality it remains highly subjective and is now less transparent.

Some of the specific questions of concern to the Linguistics faculty include:

1. How is "satisfactory" vs. "good/better" determined in the new system?
2. How does this new system correspond to existing 5-tier (E, VG, G, S, U) evaluations for promotion and tenure?
3. Are there specific requirements for promotion and tenure under the new system? [A letter circulated within CLA stated that faculty hoping to go up for tenure and promotion should receive "good" in all categories. Does this mean as an overall average for the years between hiring/last promotion and the year during which a case is being considered, or does it mean every year?]
4. Does "satisfactory" vs. "good/better" differ based on where a faculty member is in their career--assistant, associate and full?
5. Is there a direct correlation between the checked boxes on the evaluation and the faculty member’s agreed upon workload?
6. How will the new system factor into program reviews prompted by budget concerns (must a department have an overall average of "good" across faculty members in order to remain viable)?