
Faculty annual performance review

Mani Soma
Electrical Engineering

Outline

- Basic assumptions
- Case 1: adequate / good performance
- Case 2: borderline
- Case 3: continuous decline

Basic assumptions

- Dossier prepared based on guidelines and standards
 - guidelines and standards communicated clearly to faculty
- Review and recommendations from a faculty committee completed
 - committee already met with the faculty under review?
 - could be + or -

Case 1: Adequate / good

- Should happen in **most** instances
 - unless the unit has **consistently** messed up recruiting, annual reviews, and P&T
- Easy meeting
 - congratulations
 - set a higher expectation for next year...
 - **and** provide support to help career development
 - support does **not** have to be \$

Case 1: minor (?) headache

- salary raise
- “The teacher who performs his labor faithfully and without fault for five years will be given an increase of twenty-five cents per week in his pay, provided the Board of Education approves.” [Rules for Teachers, 1872]
 - (note posted on Susan Eggers’s office door)

Case 2: borderline

- Encouragement
- Plan for improvement
 - **specific** areas to be improved
 - assistance from unit / college / UW
 - set goals and expectations for next year
 - long-term plan needs annual milestones
 - **implementable and realistic**
- Put plan in faculty's record for next year's review (**closing the loop**)
 - track closely and may meet more often next year

Case 3: continuous decline

- 1% cases take 90% time
- Sub-cases and issues for consideration
 - assistant professor
 - associate / full professor
- Overall advice (free, therefore worthless)
 - listen during the meeting
 - proposed action should be a step forward for both the individual and the unit (not easy to do but need to try)
 - be honest, sincere, clear, and specific
 - not necessarily = “be nice”

...just don't do this...



THE NEW YORKER



"Do you mind if I give you a little destructive criticism?"

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 24