BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVE

Objectives
- Explore the annual performance review process across disciplines
- Create a meaningful and objective process that will:
  - Allow for productive reviews and provide faculty with targeted areas of improvement
  - Reduce subjectivity
  - Simplify the process of merit ranking faculty across a variety of different FTE allocations and work environments
- Use faculty rankings and performance to fairly distribute resources

METHODS

Rubric Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Holistic rubric with 5 point Likert scale for each section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Changed from Likert scales for each section to awarding points for each activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Similar format to version 1, but expanded and clarified specific items such as the notoriety of teaching awards (local, state, national, etc.), when to count board certification (renewal year only versus all active years), and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Expand and clarify items to generalize activities across all faculty in the department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Current Rubric Features (version 2.0)
- 67 items for clinical track faculty
- 81 items for tenure track faculty
- Items assigned point value and tallied for each section
- Each domain is weighted differently based on FTE allocations (see below).

Example Rubric and Scoring
- Imagine a tenure track employee with an FTE allocation of 20% learning, 20% engagement and 60% discovery with 5 points scored under learning, 8 points under engagement, 10 points under discovery and has outstanding citizenship (5 points).
- The employee’s overall score would be calculated as follows.

DISCUSSION

Moving forward, feedback will be gathered both internally and externally to improve the rubrics and ensure the new review process is fair, transparent, and meaningful.
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