

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee Evaluating New Evaluation Flow  
Committee Members: Jean Filetti, Veronique Frucot, Joan McMahon, and Xiao Xu

### Summary of Interview with Dean Gordon

Dean Gordon praised the new review flow, expressing his belief that the new system ensures that the FRC's judgment is appropriately an independent assessment of the candidate's dossier. He also indicated that, as under the previous system, he engaged in extensive conversations with the Provost on tenure and promotion decisions.

### Summary of Interviews with Three FRC Members<sup>1</sup>

Out of the 2 members with significant experience, one preferred the old system and the other preferred the new one.

The FRC member preferring the old system indicated that the current process diminishes the importance of the FRC's recommendations and places more weight on the Dean's recommendation. Additionally, the new process provides fewer "data points" for the FRC to look at and does not provide an opportunity for the FRC to refute the Dean's statement if the FRC believes that statement to be unfounded. This member did not see any advantages to the new system and would like to return to the previous one.

The FRC member preferring the new system liked the fact that the candidate gets the results two weeks sooner and felt the FRC's decision to be more objective since it was not affected by the Dean's opinion. Now, appropriately, the Provost responds to conflicting statements between the Dean and the DRC. The interviewee suggested that the Faculty Senate should look at data from this piloted year and felt it was too soon to identify any disadvantages or make suggestions to improve the process.

#### 1) Advantages of the new process

FRC less reactive to dean's comments.

More objective: 3 independent reviews.

More checks & balances.

Candidate gets a chance to respond to FRC's comments as well as to dean's comments.

#### 2)disadvantages

None.

#### 3) any suggestions on improving it.

None.

---

<sup>1</sup> Two of the FRC members interviewed have significant experience with the FRC and one joined in the fall and, therefore, knows only the new system.

### Summary of Interviews with Three Department Chairs

The three chairs unanimously applauded the efficiency, and the time saved, by reducing the review cycles from every year to every two years.

Two chairs applauded the removal of the first year review (done after the first semester) of new untenured faculty. One chair suggested that the practice be retained as an option (to be initiated by a department chair), in case a new faculty member who happens to be particularly out of line needs be warned in a formal evaluation process.

They welcomed the cap on the number of committees a faculty member should serve on.

One chair indicated that it was appropriate for the DRC to be composed of only tenured faculty. However, another chair pointed out that the “tenured only” policy was problematic in a small department where tenured faculty were few, and that untenured faculty could learn how to improve their own performances by serving on the DRC and seeing how the review was done.

On the issue of simultaneous reviews by the Dean and the FRC after the DRC review, all considered it a positive change, but for different reasons. Two chairs saw the advantages of 1) efficiency in time and 2) more independent and thorough review by the FRC, instead of reacting to the Dean’s review. One chair did not like the FRC having more weight than the Dean, and the new procedure was good because it reduced the FRC’s weight.

One chair suggested that a department chair have an opportunity to respond to the FRC’s and the Dean’s reviews if they are opposed to the DRC’s review. Another chair suggested that a candidate have an opportunity to respond to the FRC and the Dean.

One chair felt that because the annual review and peer review occurred at the same time, it was overwhelming for the chair to try to complete both. It was suggested that the annual review deadline be moved to a later date.