Contents

Variation in FE process across units

Currently, the way SEC and FEC write ups are sent to department admins to the point where we send everything to the Dean's office is a done a bit piecemeal and we'd love to see the whole process put onto one standardized online source.

I have 3-departments and all three seem to do the process the same, yet slightly different

I know departments vary in what is submitted according to the CBA. I think the process would be taken more seriously and hold faculty accountable if there were outside reviewers. Those serving on the FEC and the dept chair are hesitant to point out areas for improvement when they are amongst colleagues. Being evaluated by your colleagues is ineffective.

I liked the Moodle format or at least the fact it was all electronic. But I think all departments need to be on the same page. Some departments are still old school and hand in a stack of paperwork, which not only is ALOT of paper, but takes up space

I submitted a paper IPR through my departmentand did the online version. I have not recieved any feed back on either of them. I'm not sure there is a standard system that everybody uses or if people even know what they should be doing.

I was FEC chair this year. The preparation of paper voting forms was done by a staff member new to our unit, and many mistakes were made (who could vote on what, what was being voted on). Because this is very different department to department -- as far as who votes on what -- it can be error-prone. As FEC chair, it is a good thing they were on paper for me to review so I could catch the mistakes the staff person made.

The recommended template for IRPs does not represent our department's mission. This is also the case for the recommended "titles" of the files that we are to submit to Moodle.

There seems to be significant variance across all departments, programs, and campuses as to how IPR's are handled and reviewed.

They vary in how all are submitted- not all are clearly defined.

This doesn't have to be a hard system but a little automation and creating a system where everyone does the work the same way would be nice.

We have used an electronic process for quite some time. We started with SharePoint several years ago and transitioned to Moodle as soon as it was available. Those two systems still required manual creation of the IPR and then the IPR is created as a pdf to be posted electronically. It would be much better to use a database system like Sedona (there are many others out there). Right now the faculty where I work have to keep track of their IPR teaching, research, and service activities in a Word Template and then have to reenter the data into Sedona which is used for our College accreditation process.

We need more training - especially for junior faculty. Junior faculty also need access to sample dossiers so they know what to prepare. Finally, there are a lot of inconsistencies in how people report information. It would be nice if it were more consistent across faculty.

Use FE process to deliver meaningful feedback

develop specific questions or ways to identify areas of needed improvement without creating the impression of "punishing" faculty (peer evaluation has risks but perhaps some could be overcome with structured questions or quantifiable standards?)

I wish there was a way to offer faculty members advice, feedback and review in a less threatening setting then inserting it in their formal FEC findings.

Again, limited term chairs that make less money for their admin roles in a year than an adjunct gets for a 3 credit class, means that annual evals aren't practical

Annual review allows faculty the chance to alter their workload based on recent success or an evolving interest. In the end the department/faculty/students win when faculty are directed toward their strengths.

Annual review would be beneficial, but there's not enough compensation or authority in the structure of the Chair position to manage this. Chairs/Heads/Directors of comparable programs make 10x for the same work at other universities.

By referencing more specific standards & expectations

Develop more specific expectations for areas of the IPR including teaching efficacy & UM Service Difficult to find time to share FEC recommendations with each faculty member, and to have them review/sign.

I have never received feedback from the Provost's office. It seems like things are simply rubber stamped.

I know departments vary in what is submitted according to the CBA. I think the process would be taken more seriously and hold faculty accountable if there were outside reviewers. Those serving on the FEC and the dept chair are hesitant to point out areas for improvement when they are amongst colleagues. Being evaluated by your colleagues is ineffective.

I think a discussion between the FEC and the faculty member where the recommendations are delivered would be a more effective method, and more supportive than "your FEC letter is ready for signatures." I have been frustrated as a new department chair about how feedback is delivered to faculty members, especially those who are under-performing in one or more areas. It seems as though the FEC process is passive and that direct communication of feedback could be more effective in facilitating growth and change.

I'd like to be able to read my letter before my meeting. I do think it is critical to have a face-to-face meeting.

Letter or email or short meeting.

Our dean prefers to personally share recommendations with each individual faculty through email. I assume it is a task that takes appx. 1 hour.

Provide a copy to us electronically to read and consider before meeting to discuss and sign.
Same as above - it's not used as a true review tool (ie - don't meet with Dean or discuss anything) - just sign off on due date

The committee is of the whole, so all tenured and tenure-track participate. I have found the process straightforward, but I always wonder if there would be a way to offer some help to faculty members outside the formal review to give them ideas for teaching or creative work without it being seen as potentially affecting tenure or promotion.

The FEC struggles with how to incorporate the SEC review. There are lots of issues with the SEC. I do not feel the SEC should be excluded but we need a better way to evaluate faculty's interactions with

students. Right now, its only based on their instructional abilities. Faculty interact with students in various forms, such as serving as the advisor/liason for student organizations, advise research projects, advise/mentor students in their career and academic pursuits,...

The work load is reasonable, and certainly an electronic portal would make all of the versions much more efficient as evaluations move up the hierarchy. The bigger issue as a target of evaluation is the overall quality of the assessment. The departmental FEC is moderately useful, but after that, it pretty much seems like the dean and provost reiterate the initial assessment without adding any new value or context.

These questions miss the mark in my opinion. The part of the process most in need of "fixing"/improving is the way the evaluation materials are shared with and assessed by peers within the academic units. Not all units have this be a transparent process. All faculty -- regardless of rank or seniority -- should have to share the results of their year with all of their peers, and all faculty in the unit should be able to see and discuss the productivity of all other members, regardless of rank. Most specifically, Junior faculty should have as much opportunity to evaluate the productivity of their senior colleagues as the other way around. Even if the administration only requires tenured and full professors to submit materials ever few years, the unit should still have to "put their card on the table" every year. This builds cohesion and helps everybody celebrate the accomplishments of their colleagues, and it builds trust within groups by fairly revealing the contributions to the unit and the university made by EVERY individual. This will be bitterly resisted by many units, but I think such a cultural shift is absolutely necessary if UM wishes to move towards excellence. I have 20 years experience with a unit that practices this policy, and it is not an accident that this same unit is one of hte most productive and collegial and functional units not just in the university, but in the country. This is a hard question as we are required to document what we do which is very specialized on campus. Because of this we often scan and submit programs and write extensive descriptions about what we do because people outside my school don't really understand what we do. We feel that we can't just list our work because the lists don't necessarily document the impact of the event or the hours put into creating it. Since our creative endeavors are compared not only to our peers in the schools in our college, but also to scientists and business faculty and others across campus, I feel like I need to educate the people reading my file about what I do and what I do can't necessarily be compared to other people's work across campus because we are all doing very different things.   So our submissions are very detailed, descriptive, containing scans of documents and written reports. This all is first created in word and then scanned and uploaded into Moodle. If there was a template where we could write descriptions and have it be online already, then we could submit the paperwork and just scan the other items that are tangible proof of our work.

We need more information from the faculty members through the Faculty Advancement Recommendation (FAR) that they are supposed to submit. We need that input to reinforce the positive work of faculty members under consideration and at times we need information on deficiencies that might be impacting the applicants performance.

Tech literacy and following instructions

unsure whether some faculty, or our admin, could figure that out- people don't read emails, know how to add signatures to pdfs, etc

Faculty would benefit from not having to navigate moodle.

Faculty cannot follow directions. It is impressive. I have several faculty in my department who fill out the IPR wrong, who upload the wrong materials, etc. Anything to help faculty do a better job is key.

my expectation that colleagues will have 21st century work skills is often not met

Support for electronic system

Faculty sometimes are off campus, on winter vacation, and we have to email to email the evaluation, have them sign and scan back. Some times they are in a remote vacation place and we donâ€™t get the signed document back until spring term. A docusign-type signature would be better.

 I hope the workflow can be done through an electronic format as much as possible

* move to 100% on-line submissions (no paper!)

1) There is so much paper and waste involved. If we could move to a 100% electronic system, I think that would be most efficient over time, but I think it should be an all-or-nothing switch (electronic signatures, electronic files to Provost, etc.). It seems like it would lead to frustrations trying to implement several small changes each year.

1. We have to generate complex pdfs, often including scanning in paper documents such as teaching evaluations (!). This is a PIA -- nothing should be paper docs in 2019.

100% electronic process that is completed by the Faculty member. I'm thinking of UApprove or EPAF. All of this is done electronically and I think the Faculty evaluation process could also move in this direction.

2. For merit/promotion, we need collate all previous IPRs etc by hand and reassemble all the supporting docs into properly formated pdfs. That is silly. If each IPR supporting doc was retained as a separate item (evaluations, title pages etc.) and additions to each section of the IPR was entered as a discrete data item in a form, it would be trivial to update the IPRs annually (and retroactively for multi-year requests) by simply updating with new info each year and then specifying the evaluation period. I am guessing such computerized systems already exist, and they would have the added benefit of providing a database of faculty activity for other purposes...

6. Creating the packets for the Provost, our office, the department, and the faculty member. It's labor intensive and very paper intensive!

a fluid electronic process from step to step would be advantageous

Ability to review and sign the documents online. There should be no need for hard copies that need to be photocopied and go missing

Again, we use a Box-based workflow, but then also rely on paper documents. Personally I'd prefer an all electronic workflow but unsure whether some faculty, or our admin, could figure that out- people don't read emails, know how to add signatures to pdfs, etc.

Also, again, electronic collection of materials so the color paper copying can be nixed.

An electronic form that automatically populates with teaching information and any other relevant data collected by the University would be fantastic.

An online process in which the rank and increment were selected would help. Then the appropriate online documents could automatically be associated with the IPR.

An online template for sections of the IPR

Automate the process with a few simple web forms to generate the paperwork. The department admin sinks an unbelievable amount of time into copy-and-paste work to populate the forms with the FEC and FEC chairs review and recommendation. Just make sure that whatever system you eventually select is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the full diversity of faculty work, IPR content. It will be unacceptable and a step backwards if you choose a product that limits the FEC process because it lacks the flexibility to handle the diversity of activity and products.

Better online platform

Better online submission tool is needed.

Cyberbear

Digital communications is most efficient, provided the digital platform is intuitive.

Digital seems the way to go.

Digitize, and provide a way that the admins can see where each person is in the process, so we can hound who we need to hound, and help our chairs/deans meet the deadlines.

do it all on-line, if possible.

Electornically

Electronic record keeping system with mandatory review and sign offs. (Missoula County utilizes a system for contract and commissioner requests.)

Electronic submission and not paper with page numbers and signed on the last page, as currently required in CBA.

Electronic submission so data is stored and ready for merit/promotion purposes of the individual faculty member and for report/assessment purposes of the department/unit

Electronic. PLEASE! Make these bad boys electronic and use doc-sign.

Electronically

electronically instead of paper

Electronically would be super cool... just saying.

entirely electronic with the ability to view previous years materials.

Every faculty member does an IPR every year in OBEE. This means the inefficiency of the IPR process is particularly onerous.

Fully online please - too much paperwork

Get an electronic notification every time the form is signed by a different office so that we know where the evaluation status stands at.

Get rid of it!!!!

go completely paperless - all evaluations entered online and signed online - the signature process is lengthy

Have a database that remembers everything that is entered from year-to-year that can be pulled from to generate an IPR report. Then you only have to update it, rather than adding to a Word document each year that is only locally maintained by the faculty member.

Have a web portal for all of these documents throughout the process.

Having a system that electronically does the routing of documents and gets signatures electronically instead of using a paper and pencil process.

I don't think it is necessary to include all the articles that have been published. Instead, the citation should be sufficient or a link. If there is an online form that we could submit for each section of the IPR, that would be helpful and then if going up for tenure, all the materials could be combined and organized already from the previous years along with the letters from FEC committee, department chair, and dean.

I feel like it could be moved more online (the idea of printing colored pages for specific forms of recommendation seems pretty silly)

I have no problem with that process going electronic rather than the current manual methods.

I liked the Moodle format or at least the fact it was all electronic. But I think all departments need to be on the same page. Some departments are still old school and hand in a stack of paperwork, which not only is ALOT of paper, but takes up space

I would just like to once again emphasize that this could all be done online and having it online would make it a much easier process for everyone involved: those going up for review and the committee members doing the review. Example IPRs would also be helpful.

I would like to see a single management system be used for evaluations. I think this could/should be used for faculty and staff evaluations.

I wouldn't have any problem with doing this all on Moodle or Submittable or some other digital platform and signing those recommendations electronically.

I'd be happy if this step could be taken care of electronically.

Ideally, the contents of all IPRs would be available electronically - not as scanned PDFs, but as content that can be viewed in its entirety, or by section, and that could be queried for keywords and tagged per various categories.

If there was an electronic system, both the Dean's office and Provost's office could also upload their materials the individual faculty files.

If there was an online system, it would be really easy to "track" the IPR and evaluations (i.e. who is working on it and where they are at in the process). The other possible advantage of an online system would be to ensure a uniform "form" for the IPR for each department. Having a system where each department could create an online form (with text areas that would be specific to each department's needs), that the faculty member could fill out, may help the FEC, Dean, and Provost evaluate each IPR more efficiently.

If we could get most of it online that would be a help.

It could be linked to a central database where the activities being reviewed (papers published, papers reviewed, courses taught, etc.) could be stored throughout the year. Then, when evaluation time happens, we could just select the right bits of data and send it off, with the 250-word narrative on top of all of it.

it could be online, and basic info could be saved from year to year. The online form could be a more consistent template across individuals, allowing for a streamlining of the process

It needs to all be online - previous evaluations, the process, a dashboard to see where the papers are in the process... everything!

It would be GREAT if the IPR form was a 'living' online submission form that allowed us the ability to 'save drafts.' That would facilitate our ability to add things to the IPR throughout the year as they happened, and then to hit "submit" at the end of the year when the IPR is due.

It would be helpful to transition to a fully electronic system.

It would be much more effective if we didn't have to print out all the different forms on different colored paper. Having a simple form that actually worked well and could be submitted electronically would be much more effecient

It would be nice if we had one database where faculty entered all of their teaching, research, and service activities that could generate that part of the IPR.

Just make a similar format but with an electronic submission.

Maintain consistency in requirements and expectations on a year-to-year basis. Process has recently been streamlined and simplified and appears to be more effective.

make it electronic - sending around paper copies of confidential materials is archaic.

Make it electronic.

Make it electronic.

Make it electronic.

Make the entire process electronic so that at the end of the process staff can download the entire packet -- the current year's IPR, which should include copies of their past evaluations (i.e., colored sheets) -- as well as the current SE/FE/chair/dean/provost materials. Even if we continue to utilize Moodle -- if these evaluations were to be loaded INTO Moodle and made a part of the IPR then the backup/download at the end of the process would generate a complete backup.

Make the entire process online and make the letter templates more user friendly.

Make the process electronic.

Make the process electronic. It is all done on paper at the moment and is incredibly inefficient and a waste of paper resources. Should be a system that you can just log into and track progress.

More self-efficacy. I would love to not have to send out 1 million reminder emails during the process to get everything completed.

Move from hardcopy to digital. Then provide a database of previous years information.

Move online.

Move to a paperless system

Move to an entirely electronic system

No more paper!

online process

Online submission is very efficient.

Online workflow and document sharing

Online, secure, downloadable.

Our Department IPR form is old and highly outdated. It would be nice if form was electronic.

Our system currently relies on hand-delivered copies of the recommendations. Folding all of this into an online system would seem to be more effective.

paper is burdensome and wasteful use of resources

pdfs to improve efficiency and timeliness

Please make all faculty reviews digital (SEC, FEC, Director's, Dean's, Provost). This would eliminate our cumbersome administrative process involving copy machines and printed paper. It would also allow a more streamlined, digital archival system, which would be more easily accessible to all faculty.

Please make all faculty reviews digital (SEC, FEC, Director's, Dean's, Provost). This would eliminate our cumbersome administrative process involving copy machines and printed paper. It would also allow a more streamlined, digital archival system, which would be more easily accessible to all faculty.

Prepping it and putting it up on Moodle following the naming conventions explained to all of us seems pretty easy. It's better than preparing a paper copies and having to number pages, etc.

Provide an electronic system that pre-populated for demographic information and allows for electronic review and submission. Highly recommend the Submittable system

Provide an electronic system that pre-populated for demographic information and allows for electronic review and submission. Highly recommend the Submittable system

Provide an electronic system that pre-populated for demographic information and allows for electronic review and submission. Highly recommend the Submittable system

put it online

Putting everything online into a database. Then reports can pull data and standardize the way IPR's are constructed. Right now it's pretty much a free for all for faculty in terms of how they construct these.

Review and routing similar to the eprop system would be helpful here

Sec and few reviews materials in e version already. To be more effective, e version should continue as moving forward for signatures, and up to college and university levels.

Standardized formats that can be easily updated year to year. Do NOT make faculty type in information in a bunch of fields on an electronic form every year. There should be a way to upload a standardized format, and then populate an electronic form.

Submission of IPRs online and having a means to access those IPRs online would allow for more efficiency across the review progress. FEC reviewers could then access the IPRs. Within our department, all faculty review all IPRs, and thus this would facilitate accessibility.

The department admin does a bunch of unnecessary formatting and paper shuffling. What really seems insane is that we all submit IPRs electronically, then these are printed, signed, scanned, and the process repeated with the FEC, Chair and Dean evaluations. Bring us out of the dark ages.

The IPR form itself could be streamlined and standardized

The paper forms are cumbersome and take a long time to process. The best way to make review more efficient would be to switch to an online system. Entering the information by hand from the paper copies also creates more space for human error, which can be time consuming to correct and frustrating for faculty. Generating the letters/emails is also quite time consuming and again opens up the possibility for some errors.

The whole process should be electronic

They are still paper forms that need several signatures -- not a huge burden but I assume we will be moving toward electronic forms soon, which should save both resources and time.

Using an automated workflow for approvals, communications, notifications, etc. The paper process and signatures is archaic.

Using Moodle is very helpful for keeping track of documents. However, the actual reviews are still passed along in a paper format. It would be beneficial for all documents to be housed together and passed along together electronically.

Using more electronic services. Submittable?

We are signing paper documents. An electronic document would be faster and easier, and safe trees.

We have Sedona available. It would be great if it more easily created the IPR for faculty and had electronic links to all relevant academic work.

We would like to see the forms at all levels made into fillable electronic forms that can route (dept level to faculty to FEC chair, for example). We'd also like to be able to check the progress at the department admin level.

We'd like to keep IPR submission electronic, including the submission of all additional materials and letters of recommendation.

Were we to use Moodle for the submissions, the feedback could readily by shared through Moodle as well.

When you move to an online platform make sure it is flexible enough to accommodate any type of material the faculty member chooses to include in the IPR. That is, don't buy an inferior product and put us in a situation where the interface or database structure wags the FEC dog. The IT needs to serve and facilitate the FEC process, not the other way around. Given how dysfunctional UM when it comes to any organizational or IT function, the most likely outcome of this process will be a garbage web interface with a bunch of limitations hard-coded into the system that trigger a big fight with the union. Good luck.

While I know the process has been streamlined with the addition of applications submitted via Moodle, the letter templates on the correct colored paper is laborious. Why can't the letters also be uploaded electronically where the faculty member and FEC chair, Dept chair and Dean all sign electronically?

Streamline and simplify

The amount of verifying of information that I have to do. If this was an online process that was fed by information from InfoGriz (and if it's wrong, then the faculty member has to take it up with HR), that would make it much more efficient and accurate!

We have to generate complex pdfs, often including scanning in paper documents such as teaching evaluations (!). This is a PIA -- nothing should be paper docs in 2019.

For merit/promotion, we need collate all previous IPRs etc by hand and reassemble all the supporting docs into properly formated pdfs. That is silly. If each IPR supporting doc was retained as a separate item (evaluations, title pages etc.) and additions to each section of the IPR was entered as a discrete data item in a form, it would be trivial to update the IPRs annually (and retroactively for multi-year requests) by simply updating with new info each year and then specifying the evaluation period. I am

guessing such computerized systems already exist, and they would have the added benefit of providing a database of faculty activity for other purposes...

The Dean/Associate Dean give me the evaluation content to complete the Dean's Recommendation (blue form) for every individual in the categories of papers that go to the Provost (e.g. Merit, Normal, tenure, Promotion). If they could enter that information themselves, even as a draft that I then give the final check on, that would speed up the process immensely.

 Completing the Dean's Memo to the Provost. I get that it's a summary of all the files that we're turning in, but is it absolutely necessary? If it was online, then this would be taken care of by simply sorting columns.

Creating the packets for the Provost, our office, the department, and the faculty member. It's labor intensive and very paper intensive!

A system which would eliminate the need for faculty to compile past evaluations would simplify process and reduce the much confusion.

A way the process could improve is by moving it all completely online and cutting out the need for administrative associate help. We have the technology to do this (UApprove and EPAF as examples). We should make the people being evaluated solely responsible for their submissions

An electronic form that automatically populates with teaching information and any other relevant data collected by the University would be fantastic.
An online process in which the rank and increment were selected would help. Then the appropriate online documents could automatically be associated with the IPR.

An online template that all faculty fill out and submit online would streamline the process and save time from having to "pdf" all the files ourselves.

As far as the "work" of FEC, I think the process can be streamlined. As is, faculty write a letter, then the Departmental FEC reads, writes and edits their own, then the Deparment chair writes their own, and the Dean does the same. That is 4 letter for most faculty every year. While I appreciate the annual feedback as a junior faculty member, this is overkill. instead, have the faculty member write a letter, allow the Dept., Dept. chair, and Dean to submit quantitative rankings with comments only when necessary (junior faculty who need guidance, meritorious notes); require letters from Dean only for merit candidates. Or something like this to reduce the overwhelming amount of work required each year for most faculty...

be able to use prior material

Digital communications is most efficient, provided the digital platform is intuitive.

Electronic record keeping system with mandatory review and sign offs. (Missoula County utilizes a system for contract and commissioner requests.)

Evaluation process should require the cv and a clear statement summarizing how candidate meets and/or exceeds expectations in teaching, research, and service. There should be word limits (like a Fulbright application) and firm deadlines. That should solve the problem.

Every faculty member does an IPR every year in OBEE. This means the inefficiency of the IPR process is particularly onerous.

Far too many committee meetings. The process is far too time consuming, outdated and counter to best practices for employee evaluation back by research. The current evaluation system needs to be completely overhauled. It is undermining the kind of culture, characterized by cooperation and collegiality, UM would hope to create.

Have a database that remembers everything that is entered from year-to-year that can be pulled from to generate an IPR report. Then you only have to update it, rather than adding to a Word document each year that is only locally maintained by the faculty member.

I believe that it should all be done via Moodle or some other online system. I would like to see some consistency in how the information is entered and presented - e.g., create tables/forms for courses. This would save time in creating the IPR and make the FEC process more efficient.

I feel it takes a lot of time and is useless

I think a time consuming and not very useful aspect of the FEC is having to print things on different colored forms.
I would just like to once again emphasize that this could all be done online and having it online would make it a much easier process for everyone involved: those going up for review and the committee members doing the review. Example IPRs would also be helpful.

IF the format will be electronic there really wouldn't be a need for the the filling out of the FER form. If there was an online system, it would be really easy to "track" the IPR and evaluations (i.e. who is working on it and where they are at in the process). The other possible advantage of an online system would be to ensure a uniform "form" for the IPR for each department. Having a system where each department could create an online form (with text areas that would be specific to each department's needs), that the faculty member could fill out, may help the FEC, Dean, and Provost evaluate each IPR more efficiently.

it could all be done on-line, with a template form for the IPR, etc.

It could be linked to a central database where the activities being reviewed (papers published, papers reviewed, courses taught, etc.) could be stored throughout the year. Then, when evaluation time happens, we could just select the right bits of data and send it off, with the 250-word narrative on top of all of it.

it could be online, and basic info could be saved from year to year. The online form could be a more consistent template across individuals, allowing for a streamlining of the process

It would be GREAT if the IPR form was a 'living' online submission form that allowed us the ability to 'save drafts.' That would facilitate our ability to add things to the IPR throughout the year as they happened, and then to hit "submit" at the end of the year when the IPR is due.

It would be nice if we had one database where faculty entered all of their teaching, research, and service activities that could generate that part of the IPR.

It would be nice to not have to reproduce my entire CV. Why can't I just upload my CV? It lists EVERYTHING you need to know. Instead, I update my CV and then spend a chunk of time copying and pasting sections from my CV to the cumbersome MS Word document.

Maintain consistency in requirements and expectations on a year-to-year basis. Process has recently been streamlined and simplified and appears to be more effective.

Make the entire process online and make the letter templates more user friendly.

More self-efficacy. I would love to not have to send out 1 million reminder emails during the process to get everything completed.

online process

Our system currently relies on hand-delivered copies of the recommendations. Folding all of this into an online system would seem to be more effective.

Please make all faculty reviews digital (SEC, FEC, Director's, Dean's, Provost). This would eliminate our cumbersome administrative process involving copy machines and printed paper. It would also allow a more streamlined, digital archival system, which would be more easily accessible to all faculty. Provide an electronic system that pre-populated for demographic information and allows for electronic review and submission. Highly recommend the Submittable system

Putting everything online into a database. Then reports can pull data and standardize the way IPR's are constructed. Right now it's pretty much a free for all for faculty in terms of how they construct these.

Send electronically and have electronic signatures, but have the letters saved in a system that faculty can access.

Standardized formats that can be easily updated year to year. Do NOT make faculty type in information in a bunch of fields on an electronic form every year. There should be a way to upload a standardized format, and then populate an electronic form.

The current process of uploading and reading IPRs in Moodle is better than the previosu all-paper process, but still needs a lot of streamlining.

The current submission method is confusing, there are many levels of the website we have to go through to get to the submission page. I would like to be able to click on a provided link and immediately submit documents.

The department admin does a bunch of unnecessary formatting and paper shuffling. What really seems insane is that we all submit IPRs electronically, then these are printed, signed, scanned, and the process repeated with the FEC, Chair and Dean evaluations. Bring us out of the dark ages.

There should be one place to submit all materials. We should be able to change the permissions on the files as it goes up through the ranks. Right now the process is the worst for our admins.

This could be streamlined by just having statement or check box of agreement or disagreement from the chair and dean and then a place for comments

This doesn't have to be a hard system but a little automation and creating a system where everyone does the work the same way would be nice.

This is a hard question as we are required to document what we do which is very specialized on campus. Because of this we often scan and submit programs and write extensive descriptions about what we do because people outside my school don't really understand what we do. We feel that we can't just list our work because the lists don't necessarily document the impact of the event or the hours put into creating it. Since our creative endeavors are compared not only to our peers in the schools in our college, but also to scientists and business faculty and others across campus, I feel like I need to educate the people reading my file about what I do and what I do can't necessarily be compared to other people's work across campus because we are all doing very different things.   So our submissions are very detailed, descriptive, containing scans of documents and written reports. This all is first created in word and then scanned and uploaded into Moodle. If there was a template where we could write descriptions and have it be online already, then we could submit the paperwork and just scan the other items that are tangible proof of our work.

Use a template where faculty can upload into different sections instead of uploading one long document that is difficulty to move between activities, required documents.

Using more electronic services. Submittable?

We are signing paper documents. An electronic document would be faster and easier, and safe trees. We have used an electronic process for quite some time. We started with SharePoint several years ago and transitioned to Moodle as soon as it was available. Those two systems still required manual creation of the IPR and then the IPR is created as a pdf to be posted electronically. It would be much better to use a database system like Sedona (there are many others out there). Right now the faculty where I work have to keep track of their IPR teaching, research, and service activities in a Word Template and then have to reenter the data into Sedona which is used for our College accreditation process.

Sharing and signing

Faculty sometimes are off campus, on winter vacation, and we have to email to email the evaluation, have them sign and scan back. Some times they are in a remote vacation place and we donâ€™t get the signed document back until spring term. A docusign-type signature would be better.

2. The chasing of faculty members and chairs for their signature. If it was online, the file would not be able to go forward until the papers were signed. If they don't get that done by a certain date, then that's their fault, not that of their department admin, which is where a lot of the faculty member seem to place the blame right now.

A modern electronic platform like DocuSign that every other modern organization in the country uses.

An online approval process would be great - we have ECur, UApprove, and a host of other forms, surely there's a way to get a digital signature on the recommendation forms.

An online or email based system would be easier than having to physically sign and submit it.

Create a system that routes electronic documents for approval and use something like Adobe DocuSign for signatures.

Currently, faculty stop by their admin's desk to review & physically sign. I do not know that switching to an electronic signature system (i.e. DocuSign) would be beneficial/more efficient. Setting up an electronic system with specific permissions for each document for each faculty member seems extremely work-intensive.

Difficult to find time to share FEC recommendations with each faculty member, and to have them review/sign.

Digital communications is most efficient, provided the digital platform is intuitive.

Docusign-type electronic approval that they have read the document?

Earlier deadlines for submission, earlier review, and then electronic review and signing.

electronic -- so that I'm not responsible for ensuring faculty read their review and sign.

Electronic record keeping system with mandatory review and sign offs. (Missoula County utilizes a system for contract and commissioner requests.)

Electronic sharing and signing would be an improvement.

Electronic sharing and signing would be an improvement.

Electronic sharing and signing would be great.

Electronic Signature Authority would expatiate the process.

Electronic signatures would be helpful. Many faculty forget to sign the SEC reports and/or the FEC reports before these are forwarded to the department chair.

Electronically

Faculty must be required to sign the documents but can attach rebuttal comments, should the faculty member choose.

go completely paperless - all evaluations entered online and signed online - the signature process is lengthy

go electronic!!!! Allow electronic signatures or some other kind on online acknowledgement that the information has been read.

have an online process that could be monitored by Dean's Assistant/Office Staff, reminders/prompts to keep the approval and signature process moving forward

I don't know what the lower-level processes are, but making sure everything is signed properly would be a great help.

I used Docusign this year with one of my departments and I thought it worked pretty well. It allowed the faculty member to read what was said about them in the privacy of their own office and if they didn't agree with what was said, I wasn't around for them to take it out on.

I would just like to once again emphasize that this could all be done online and having it online would make it a much easier process for everyone involved: those going up for review and the committee members doing the review. Example IPRs would also be helpful.

It is pretty straight forward, you tell them it is ready for their signature, and they come and sign it. Or they don't.

It would be nice to have an electronic system where the faculty member can respond to each step of the evaluation (student, department, dean, provost). In this case a response is only a clarification and not a point of disagreement that needs formal resolution (e.g. the faculty member may want to highlight something in the IPR that did not make it in the written evaluation).

Make the signature process electronic.

More self-efficacy. I would love to not have to send out 1 million reminder emails during the process to get everything completed.

Obviously, allow review and electronic signatures... similar to "UApprove."

Online recommendation submission and signatures

Provide a copy to us electronically to read and consider before meeting to discuss and sign.

Review and routing similar to the eprop system would be helpful here

Send electronically and have electronic signatures, but have the letters saved in a system that faculty can access.

Signing paperwork always seems to fall after the semester is over and I am on break/traveling. I typically receive a last minute email stating I need to sign things ASAP when I am not on campus or even in the state. Allowing electronic sharing/signing would be more helpful.

The submission is a simple email or upload to a UM box folder of the required materials. It seems pretty efficient. We get an email to come review and sign sometime over a two week period with an administrative assistant at the department and Dean level. This seems fairly efficient

There's a big lag time between application and approval and it's not terribly clear when the Provost's approval or rejection will arrive. Mailed letters are even less efficient than the reports from directors, FEC chair and dean, which are at least in a main office and available for me to review when prompted by staff. I don't check my actual mailbox often because it's mostly junk.

This could be digital as well, eliminating need to find faculty, multiple times (if revisions required).

This could be digital as well, eliminating need to find faculty, multiple times (if revisions required).

We are signing paper documents. An electronic document would be faster and easier, and safe trees.

We don't get to see them usually until day they're due - "sign here' - "Next"....

Other

We don't currently require outside letters. In theory, we're in favor of outside reviewers. In practice, we are no longer able to provide the resources to faculty members to get out and do the things that build those external relationships. Or departmental operating budget used to provide enough travel money that untenured faculty could go to a conference every year (every other year for tenured). Now the budget isn't enough to cover our copier.

Align them more explicitly with unit standards, and highlight high impact practices over SCH/FTE.

Automate the process with a few simple web forms to generate the paperwork. The department admin sinks an unbelievable amount of time into copy-and-paste work to populate the forms with the FEC and FEC chairs review and recommendation. Just make sure that whatever system you eventually select is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the full diversity of faculty work, IPR content. It will be unacceptable and a step backwards if you choose a product that limits the FEC process because it lacks the flexibility to handle the diversity of activity and products.

De-emphasize the IPR committee and weight the Chair, the Dean and the Provost more. Instead, I write my document for the IPR committee (my peers) when instead I should be writing it for higher ups. My department values accomplishments that don't, quite frankly, improve the University. I am confident that the administration knows what impacts the University far more than a non-productive, tenured full professor.

Far too many committee meetings. The process is far too time consuming, outdated and counter to best practices for employee evaluation back by research. The current evaluation system needs to be completely overhauled. It is undermining the kind of culture, characterized by cooperation and collegiality, UM would hope to create.

First, we must included documentation of past reviews (why isn't this material already catalogued somewhere? We have already submitted it, sometimes as far back as one or more decades!)

For example, this survey serves a great demonstration of potentially useful tech that ends up perverting the process and adding time while reducing usability and information: I, like many faculty members, have multiple roles in the FEC process, yet this survey instrument is so inflexible that it cannot record that information (only get to select one role), and as a result I have to fill out the survey multiple times!

Have faculty voting ballots automated and online. This would allow faculty to vote anonymously and the comments for each faculty member would be typed. By having them typed the comments are legible and much easier for the FEC faculty chair to directly import into the review letter. Also, this would free up a staff's time that goes into printing, sorting and distributing those voting ballots. It would also automate the tallying of votes.

Have stricter guidelines for publications.

I can't think of anything. It is simply a depressing activity to have to perform.

I don't care. The provost's office means so little to me that it is hard to even have a feeling about it. The dean's ranking and recommendation is the only thing that matters. Getting a form letter from the Provost is a waste of my time and a waste of the paper it's printed on.

I don't have experience with other processes but i feel like the one we are using is extremely negative and creates a bunch of wasted time.

I don't think it is necessary to include all the articles that have been published. Instead, the citation should be sufficient or a link. If there is an online form that we could submit for each section of the IPR, that would be helpful and then if going up for tenure, all the materials could be combined and organized already from the previous years along with the letters from FEC committee, department chair, and dean.

I don't think it's necessary to evaluate the faculty so frequently.

I don't think that faculty should nominate themselves for merits. This encourages self-aggrandizing and discourages true reflection on how we might be more effective at our jobs. People often lead with their strongest suit and don't lead with- this is the most challenging part of my job, what are some ideas of how to make it easier.

In our area, many folks just don't do it because it takes so much time.

It would be greatly appreciated with other tenure-track faculty members actually attended the meetings; this is especially frustrating when we have so few voting members left. If others participated, the process would be much more efficient.

It would be helpful if the Dean's report provided a merit ranking range (e.g. 1-15; 16-25; 26-46 etc.) and with the faculty member's ranking. That way, the faculty member could better gage if they are likely or less likely to receive an merit increase.

It would be nice to know the timeline. Could you all triage cases - slam dunk, maybe, difficult and handle the slam dunk cases first.

It's time for a change

Loading IPRs on Box works well.

One area that would be very helpful to document more comprehensively is faculty engagement in High Impact Practices. We also need to capture individual faculty member's participation in assessment practices.

One issue is that so many faculty members have retired or left the department.   Most of us are now on the committee every year.   This puts additional pressure on all faculty during the evaluation process.

Our department is too small for self-evaluation. It should occur at the college level.

Participation in the faculty evaluation process should be voluntary for contingent faculty who believe UM will not renew their contract for the next year. For the most part, evaluative feedback is pro forma, and this makes the process seem like merely lost time.

Second, the creation of a PDF, unless you have access to Adobe Pro, is tricky.

Second, we must create duplicate narratives and summations of accomplishments. Rather than producing ONE piece of paper that establishes an argument for normal or merit, we produce lists, narratives, summations, include evidence (sometimes notes and announcement cards!!!!).

Self evaluation and the use of videos provide complementary input for formative and summative evaluation.

Substitution of peer review, measurement of learning gains, or other methods to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Peer ratings of teaching performance cover those aspects of teaching that students are not in a position to evaluate.

Take the popularity contest out of the process. That would make the work more effective, providing a level playing field.

The bottleneck is in the alignment between composing a one page evaluation and the discussion and or revisions the committeewishes to make on the final recommendation. There is a cynical inflation of evaluation for merit requests.

The dean's office emails a scan (pdf) of a print of the final recommendation. So, super efficient to receive it, but it always makes me mad that we do not have a chance to proof it before submission to the Provost. On three separate occasions the dean has included factually incorrect statements about my performance (number of pubs, number of classes, etc). This is infuriating, but because the document has already been submitted to the provost when finally get to review it.

The FEC should see the SEC report before making its determination. Genuine critique of scholarly productivity would work toward building a scholarly community.

The long wait seems unnecessary

The main useful feedback out of the whole FEC process comes from the FEC. The feedback and approbation of my peers is useful, and a validation of the effort I put into my job. The chair typically adds some value, but not always. Current chair is awesome, past not so much. An atta boy from the dean is also a nice touch, because I know my dean knows and values my work. The provost is just a figurehead and doesn't mean a thing. We should get rid of the union, delegate the final word on performance evaluation and salary increment and incentive/reward structure down to the dean, and take the provost out of the whole FEC process.

The Provost Office could have a clear reliable timeline for when the recommendations will be released. It varies every year.

The system needs to be completely overhauled and a new system created that is guided by best practices for creating employee satisfaction. A new system needs to be created for evaluating employees that is grounded in solid research. The current system is implicitly hierarchal and annually pits colleagues against colleagues in competions for small merit, raises. Much research demonstrates that such a systems corrodes employee job satisfaction and lowers aggregate productivity. In my judgement, we continue to use an outdated systems that is conuterproductive, which desperately needs to be updated.

There's a big lag time between application and approval and it's not terribly clear when the Provost's approval or rejection will arrive. Mailed letters are even less efficient than the reports from directors, FEC chair and dean, which are at least in a main office and available for me to review when prompted by staff. I don't check my actual mailbox often because it's mostly junk.

There's nothing broken with our FEC process except that administrators seem to barely read them. Please focus efforts on what matters here at UM -- fix the administration!!   The faculty is not at fault for the declining enrollment and it seems like you have an ulterior motive with this FEC review. What problem are you trying to fix with this committee and process? You have to send out a survey to find out if it is broken? Well, it isn't. The provost hasn't even been here for one review cycle and he already decided it needs fixing! Focus on what matters. Good golly.

These questions miss the mark in my opinion. The part of the process most in need of "fixing"/improving is the way the evaluation materials are shared with and assessed by peers within the academic units. Not all units have this be a transparent process. All faculty -- regardless of rank or seniority -- should have to share the results of their year with all of their peers, and all faculty in the unit should be able to see and discuss the productivity of all other members, regardless of rank. Most specifically, Junior faculty should have as much opportunity to evaluate the productivity of their senior colleagues as the other way around. Even if the administration only requires tenured and full professors to submit materials ever few years, the unit should still have to "put their card on the table" every year. This builds cohesion and helps everybody celebrate the accomplishments of their colleagues, and it builds trust within groups by fairly revealing the contributions to the unit and the university made by EVERY individual. This will be bitterly resisted by many units, but I think such a cultural shift is absolutely necessary if UM wishes to move towards excellence. I have 20 years experience with a unit that practices this policy, and it is not an accident that this same unit is one of hte most productive and collegial and functional units not just in the university, but in the country.

Too many faculty do too little and are not held accountable. There need to be higher consequences for failing to contribute. Service should not be optional or voluntary. "Below normal" evaluations are rare because faculty have no incentive to hold their peers accountable. Department Chairs and Deans should factor this into their decision making, acknowledge that sub-par performance will rarely be called out by peers, and take it upon themselves to hold under-performing faculty accountable. The CBA uses "below normal" evaluations as a warning and opportunity to improve, yet faculty are unwilling to use this category - this sets up a situation where those who contribute have a difficult time differentiating themselves from those who do not, and those not contributing are never incentivized to do otherwise.

We don't have an efficient system to do this. We all try to keep track of faculty activity but it is haphazard and based largely on the information that comes to us via news releases and other public sources. We are not sure we are accurately representing the totality of faculty activity in our assessment and accreditation documents. This also limits our ability to fairly and consistently recognize and celebrate faculty accomplishments.

We need more faculty in our department. A small faculty means that too much service, including the FEC, falls on a small number of people.

We need more training - especially for junior faculty. Junior faculty also need access to sample dossiers so they know what to prepare. Finally, there are a lot of inconsistencies in how people report information. It would be nice if it were more consistent across faculty.

What I do not want to see is a proprietary system where each participant has to â€œpoint and clickâ€• to fill out individual boxes. I strongly urge that we have the option of creating our own, single document, that we can upload for review.

When peer evaluations are performed, they are more supportive of evidence-based teaching than student evaluations.

When you move to an online platform make sure it is flexible enough to accommodate any type of material the faculty member chooses to include in the IPR. That is, don't buy an inferior product and put us in a situation where the interface or database structure wags the FEC dog. The IT needs to serve and facilitate the FEC process, not the other way around. Given how dysfunctional UM when it comes to any organizational or IT function, the most likely outcome of this process will be a garbage web interface with a bunch of limitations hard-coded into the system that trigger a big fight with the union. Good luck.

Where to start? It is ridiculously byzantine and requires hours of work every year. Our area requires layers and layers of documentation; much of it redundantly adding to past documentation.

Why wouldn't the cv and or resume and one (1) UNO statement suffice?

Incomplete materials

To be fair, the faculty member should organize most of his or her documents and supporting documentation.

Be sure they provide all information and that the forms are complete. Some are very good at this, others have issues.

Do I say this again? Faculty MUST be responsible for their own careers. This is a process whereby faculty receive promotions, tenure and/or merit and other than providing support in the form of completing the various evaluation forms, staff should not be expected to do anything more than that. I should not be responsible for hunt down past evaluation forms nor even to ensure that a faculty member's submission is complete.   I hazard a guess that if a student handed in an incomplete project, which determines their grade and even whether they graduate, very few faculty would think it was their responsibility to complete the project on the student's behalf. That's what the administration and faculty expect of staff. Please look at this process as if the faculty member is a student and place the same expectations faculty have of their students upon the faculty, throughout their career on campus, for the faculty evaluation process

If there was a pick and choose tool for previously submitted documents or evaluations.so the faculty could find the evaluations needed without having the admin try to track down their paperwork.

In addition, every year, faculty have questions about what to include in their IPRs. I know there is information on the Provost's website, but perhaps an itemized checklist would help.

IPRs are submitted to our admin person, who then uploads them to Box, but because of competence issues on the part of the admin person, documents are often missing and chair (me) spends a lot of time making sure files are complete. It's clunky.

It would help Chairs if faculty process for submission required completeness of submissions to avoid incomplete IPR's.

Materials to be included are actually included - including evalatiions of teaching

Once again, the problem is not sharing recommendations with faculty but ensuring that a copy of every evaluation, whether it's an SEC evaluation or an FEC evaluation or a dean or provost -- faculty MUST take responsibility for their own materials.

Shifting the process to something online, that does not allow incomplete information to pass through, would be a huge help.

Sometimes the faculty members don't have their own previous evaluation files, including the letter from the Provost from the previous year, so they can't fully submit IPRs and other additional supporting materials. I don't know why it takes the file getting all the way to the Dean's Office for that to be realized. The faculty should have a checklist and/or be mentored by the FEC to turn in all of the CBA-required documents.

The problem is not with sharing the dean's recommendations with faculty but with ensuring faculty members keep their copy for future evaluation periods. At present the dean's recommendations are provided in hard copy for the departmental copy, i.e., the faculty member's evaluation file, and electronically to the chair and the faculty member.   There's no guarantee that the hard copy won't disappear.

There is no accountability of the faculty member's to respond to FEC requests for more information. If they do not provide information or even respond to the request or if they do not follow suggested formatting then they don't have to comply and they can't have any repercussions. 10.210 I think they should at least have a written acknowledge of receipt and record in their materials of no response.

Late submission and missed deadlines

IPRs could be submitted on-time with all signatures

Again, there are no consequences for faculty who do not attend to deadlines.

Department chair effectiveness and timeliness on SEC process.

Earlier deadlines for submission, earlier review, and then electronic review and signing.

get it done on time

More detail of what needs to be included in what order and what format. Maybe a template of a successful IPR. Also there needs to be more advanced notice that these are due.

More timely.

My department's FEC is always late in submitting its reports to me. There are no consequences if the individual faculty members are late with their IPR submission to the FEC and/or if the FEC is late with its submission to the department chair.

My only suggestion would be to provide the forms a little earlier to give more time to review if needed

One document, one deadline, one signature process. Shall I tell you about all the folks who miss the deadline. Good grief. I'd like to get a merit for actually meeting deadlines, would that be possible?

pdfs to improve efficiency and timeliness

People don't recognize that the deadlines are for FINAL items to be submitted, not items that still need to be typed up and/or reviewed and signed. For example, if the FEC Chair turns in their committee's notes to the admin *on* Nov. 15 to type up on the FEC evaluation form (pink), then that crunches the timeline for the Dept. Chair. The admin has to type it up, get the faculty member to review it and sign it, and then pass it along to the Chair. Let's say that happens within a week, that makes it Nov. 22. If the Chair is aware that the completed, signed forms need to be in the Dean's Office by Dec. 15, then that gives the Chair about two weeks to do their bit to get it to the admin to type up... to get the faculty member to review and sign their form... to get the files to the Dean's Office.

Receiving the IPRs in a more timely fashion from the FEC would help

Several of my units do not do this in accordance with the timeline set out in the CBA

Somehow the 15th comes and goes before the recommendations are ready. If the process was online, I think it would be more effective in meeting the 15th deadline.

Stricter enforcement of the deadlines!

Submission of forms prior to due date - to allow for time for signatures, etc.

The biggest difficulty we see is faculty turning evaluations in and SEC write ups being sent to us in a timely manner.

The hardest part of the process is getting faculty to submit their student evaluations in time for the SEC to meet.

The most difficult part is getting the faculty to actually submit IPRs, to sign their letters, and to get the SubFEC, FEC, and Chair to meet their deadlines.

IPRs

To be fair, the faculty member should organize most of his or her documents and supporting documentation.

Align them more explicitly with unit standards, and highlight high impact practices over SCH/FTE.

An online template for sections of the IPR

Develop more specific expectations for areas of the IPR including teaching efficacy & UM Service

I don't think it is necessary to include all the articles that have been published. Instead, the citation should be sufficient or a link. If there is an online form that we could submit for each section of the IPR, that would be helpful and then if going up for tenure, all the materials could be combined and organized already from the previous years along with the letters from FEC committee, department chair, and dean.

I would rather just submitting my CV and highlighting the changes since the last review. My CV should stand on its own; if it can't, then I wasn't productive enough. In reviewing others in my department, I feel strongly that measurable outcomes must be emphasized and the CV is the best way to communicate those. Instead, less productive faculty in my department pad their IPR documents with non-meaningful, non-measurable "accomplishments" since the CV is more of an after thought compared with the letter.

It could be linked to a central database where the activities being reviewed (papers published, papers reviewed, courses taught, etc.) could be stored throughout the year. Then, when evaluation time happens, we could just select the right bits of data and send it off, with the 250-word narrative on top of all of it.

It is essential that those responsible for the faculty evaluation process -- the UFA and the Provost's Office -- make it clear to faculty from their first year and remind faculty EVERY YEAR that their IPR is their responsibility. At no point on this campus since 2002 has it ever been made clear to faculty that their IPR determines their raise/promotion/tenure/merit and that it's their responsibility to ensure they have and retain every colored copy of their evaluations from their first year. It is not my job to ensure that they get a raise, promotion or tenure.

It would be nice to not have to reproduce my entire CV. Why can't I just upload my CV? It lists EVERYTHING you need to know. Instead, I update my CV and then spend a chunk of time copying and pasting sections from my CV to the cumbersome MS Word document.

Much of the information we put in the IPR is already in our CV. It would be a lot easier on the faculty member and the FEC if we could just refer to the CV for that information (e.g., courses taught, publications, grants, etc.

Our Department IPR form is old and highly outdated. It would be nice if form was electronic.

Simplify the IPR.

The IPR form itself could be streamlined and standardized

The quality of the IPR varies dramatically by Department

This is a hard question as we are required to document what we do which is very specialized on campus. Because of this we often scan and submit programs and write extensive descriptions about what we do because people outside my school don't really understand what we do. We feel that we can't just list our work because the lists don't necessarily document the impact of the event or the hours put into creating it. Since our creative endeavors are compared not only to our peers in the schools in our college, but also to scientists and business faculty and others across campus, I feel like I need to educate the people reading my file about what I do and what I do can't necessarily be compared to other people's work across campus because we are all doing very different things.   So our submissions are very detailed, descriptive, containing scans of documents and written reports. This all is first created in word and then scanned and uploaded into Moodle. If there was a template where we could write descriptions and have it be online already, then we could submit the paperwork and just scan the other items that are tangible proof of our work.

We have a standard version of an IPR form that already is very effective.

we have required a very thorough IPR where each item under evaluation requires a citation to the external document file, down to the page number. Its very tedious to prepare and to review. If the IPR was a fillable PDF the process of evaluation and comparison between faculty members for the purposes of merit would be expedited.

HRS systems to support FE

Have a place in the HR Banner area that has all the necessary dates and promotions, not just the ones that have a monetary designation. If it is asked for on the FER then it should be available in the HR screens. Or, have the FER autofilled from HR or the Provost Office.

I would like to see a single management system be used for evaluations. I think this could/should be used for faculty and staff evaluations.

Make it digital- could put it in HR folder.

Share the promotions so that titles are updated across all data bases.

FE process need not change

By keeping the process hard copy as it always was instead of electronic.

continue as presently constituted

Efficient as is.

How we review it works well for us

I don't understand what the problem is. The process works fine as is. People around here should stop trying to fix things that aren't broken.

I have no problem with the IPR submission method and process.

I see no point in changing the process.

I think it is fine how it is.

It is very efficient: we use Moodle.
It works fairly well as it currently operates, except for our department needed outside input, since we're interdisciplinary, and more substantial student input.

It works fine as is.

it works pretty well. let's not complicate it. The technological tail should not wag the ipr dog.

It's not difficult since the documents are paper and we just read them and sign them.

No changes necessary.

No. Our current system works well.

None, the process works well as-is

Our IPR review is quite effective and I would be reluctant to change it. We evaluated eight applications this year - 2 normals, 4 merits, 1 tenure, 1 promotion. This is about the right balance of applications. The staggering of associate reviews (every other year) and full reviews (every third year) is about right from a committee perspective. We could consider an abbreviated IPR and review process for normal requests but this isn't essential. The CBA and Unit Standards provide effective guidance, our committee procedures are well-practiced, and engagement with our administrative associate is about right. Collectively, our review process is quite efficient.

Overall I find the process relatively efficient, but lacking in some transparency after the IPRs move outside the Dean's office.

Process appears to be working well from my perspective.

seem pretty efficient overall

Switching to Moodle or other platform adds more complexity to a process that works well as it is currently formulated

The method is already very efficient. It might be one of the most efficient things we do, in fact. This is an odd thing to digitize, given the university's other priorities.

The paper version works fine. I would rather see the University spend time on recruitment and retention rather than this process.

The process works fine as is.

There's nothing broken with our FEC process except that administrators seem to barely read them. Please focus efforts on what matters here at UM -- fix the administration!!   The faculty is not at fault for the declining enrollment and it seems like you have an ulterior motive with this FEC review. What problem are you trying to fix with this committee and process? You have to send out a survey to find out if it is broken? Well, it isn't. The provost hasn't even been here for one review cycle and he already decided it needs fixing! Focus on what matters. Good golly.
We have an efficient process already for circulating materials. I apologize for not having any concrete suggestions.

Faculty self and peer evaluation

Self evaluation and the use of videos provide complementary input for formative and summative evaluation.

Substitution of peer review, measurement of learning gains, or other methods to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Peer ratings of teaching performance cover those aspects of teaching that students are not in a position to evaluate.

The faculty member should rate themselves in each category

When peer evaluations are performed, they are more supportive of evidence-based teaching than student evaluations.

Evaluator roles

Again, limited term chairs that make less money for their admin roles in a year than an adjunct gets for a 3 credit class, means that annual evals aren't practical

And, training for FEC Chairs - there is almost no consistency in evaluations and some units rotate FEC Chairs yearly, so they have no clue what they are doing

Annual review allows faculty the chance to alter their workload based on recent success or an evolving interest. In the end the department/faculty/students win when faculty are directed toward their strengths.

Annual review would be beneficial, but there's not enough compensation or authority in the structure of the Chair position to manage this. Chairs/Heads/Directors of comparable programs make 10x for the same work at other universities.

clear expectations, and consistent format

Clearer and less ambiguous review criteria would be helpful to all. Currently lots of time spent on trying to interpret where someone fits in evaluation categories. We are trying to be objective and factual to a standard that is nebulous and poorly understood.

Clearer guidelines as to how the dean will evaluate the IPRs would help as well.

De-emphasize the IPR committee and weight the Chair, the Dean and the Provost more. Instead, I write my document for the IPR committee (my peers) when instead I should be writing it for higher ups. My department values accomplishments that don't, quite frankly, improve the University. I am confident that the administration knows what impacts the University far more than a non-productive, tenured full professor.

FEC could provide a draft of their recommendation for faculty to review for any factual errors.

Having clearer guidelines in the unit standards- possibly even a rubric that specifically outlines what constitutes "normal increment," "less than normal increment," "meritorious," etc.

I feel there is a bigger issue than just review and sign. The entire process needs revision, with increased clarity in process, defined requirements, and communication.

I usually summarize my CV in my FEC statement and then this statement is paraphrased by the chair, whose statement is paraphrased by the Dean. While this ensures that people are actually reading my original statement, I am not sure that this is the most effective use of time for chairs and deans.

Our dean prefers to personally share recommendations with each individual faculty through email. I assume it is a task that takes appx. 1 hour.

Digital archiving of faculty records

It would also allow a more streamlined, digital archival system, which would be more easily accessible to all faculty.

We need a single online system that everyone uses and will act as a long term repository.

We have to generate complex pdfs, often including scanning in paper documents such as teaching evaluations (!). This is a PIA -- nothing should be paper docs in 2019.

The color-coded system works well for me personally (I am very visual) but I know it creates some logistical headaches among other admins (i.e. ordering paper, loading copiers, etc.) . Is it possible to keep the colors if migrating to an electronic system?

For merit/promotion, we need collate all previous IPRs etc by hand and reassemble all the supporting docs into properly formated pdfs. That is silly. If each IPR supporting doc was retained as a separate item (evaluations, title pages etc.) and additions to each section of the IPR was entered as a discrete data item in a form, it would be trivial to update the IPRs annually (and retroactively for multi-year requests) by simply updating with new info each year and then specifying the evaluation period. I am guessing such computerized systems already exist, and they would have the added benefit of providing a database of faculty activity for other purposes...

Additionally, please compile a central database of past evaluations. This would eliminate the need for faculty to compile past evaluations, and would reduce errors.

be able to use prior material

Compilation of all materials in electronic format.

Digital seems the way to go.

Electronic record keeping system with standardized procedures and policies.

Electronic record keeping system.

Electronic submission so data is stored and ready for merit/promotion purposes of the individual faculty member and for report/assessment purposes of the department/unit

entirely electronic with the ability to view previous years materials.

Every faculty member does an IPR every year in OBEE. This means the inefficiency of the IPR process is particularly onerous.

First, it would help to have electronic access to past student evaluations.

Have a database that remembers everything that is entered from year-to-year that can be pulled from to generate an IPR report. Then you only have to update it, rather than adding to a Word document each year that is only locally maintained by the faculty member.

However, I understand that we are no longer allowed to utilize Moodle as an institution for the IPR process. I would STRONGLY encourage this process to remain similar. Particularly, the option to upload a single PDF document with all parts of the process to a single repository.

I don't think it is necessary to include all the articles that have been published. Instead, the citation should be sufficient or a link. If there is an online form that we could submit for each section of the IPR, that would be helpful and then if going up for tenure, all the materials could be combined and organized already from the previous years along with the letters from FEC committee, department chair, and dean.

I think the whole process could be done online, which is more expedient and efficient and allows for easier storage of information from year to year

I think translating this into a digital process that is archived would help the process. Numeric fields will pull down functionality would help standardize data collection.

Ideally, the contents of all IPRs would be available electronically - not as scanned PDFs, but as content that can be viewed in its entirety, or by section, and that could be queried for keywords and tagged per various categories.

If there was a pick and choose tool for previously submitted documents or evaluations.so the faculty could find the evaluations needed without having the admin try to track down their paperwork.

It could be linked to a central database where the activities being reviewed (papers published, papers reviewed, courses taught, etc.) could be stored throughout the year. Then, when evaluation time happens, we could just select the right bits of data and send it off, with the 250-word narrative on top of all of it.

It would be GREAT if the IPR form was a 'living' online submission form that allowed us the ability to 'save drafts.' That would facilitate our ability to add things to the IPR throughout the year as they happened, and then to hit "submit" at the end of the year when the IPR is due.

It would be nice if we had one database where faculty entered all of their teaching, research, and service activities that could generate that part of the IPR.

Keep this as PDF process, where documents get shared via s central repository.

Move from hardcopy to digital. Then provide a database of previous years information.

Provide an electronic system that pre-populated for demographic information and allows for electronic review and submission. Highly recommend the Submittable system

Putting everything online into a database. Then reports can pull data and standardize the way IPR's are constructed. Right now it's pretty much a free for all for faculty in terms of how they construct these.

Send electronically and have electronic signatures, but have the letters saved in a system that faculty can access.

The problem is not with sharing the dean's recommendations with faculty but with ensuring faculty members keep their copy for future evaluation periods. At present the dean's recommendations are

provided in hard copy for the departmental copy, i.e., the faculty member's evaluation file, and electronically to the chair and the faculty member.   There's no guarantee that the hard copy won't disappear.

This is a hard question as we are required to document what we do which is very specialized on campus. Because of this we often scan and submit programs and write extensive descriptions about what we do because people outside my school don't really understand what we do. We feel that we can't just list our work because the lists don't necessarily document the impact of the event or the hours put into creating it. Since our creative endeavors are compared not only to our peers in the schools in our college, but also to scientists and business faculty and others across campus, I feel like I need to educate the people reading my file about what I do and what I do can't necessarily be compared to other people's work across campus because we are all doing very different things.   So our submissions are very detailed, descriptive, containing scans of documents and written reports. This all is first created in word and then scanned and uploaded into Moodle. If there was a template where we could write descriptions and have it be online already, then we could submit the paperwork and just scan the other items that are tangible proof of our work.

We should have a central IPR database where we can register research, teaching, and service contributions - it could be used to generate summary data, automate IPR forms, and help faculty ensure their CVs are complete and up-to-date (could even automatically generate/update CVs). We'd like the dean's recommendation to also routinely pass to the department admin so that we can have complete records, preferably electronically routed.

Course evaluations and SEC

It can be challenging to get students to volunteer for the committee. And even more challenging to get them to come into the office and wade/read through so many written evaluation comments. It seems like there must be an easier way? (

Bottom-up. Amy Kinch and I met with University Faculty Association representatives last Tuesday (9 April) to discuss this matter with them. They suggested that I petition for revisions to the UFA contract. I have now done so. The document summarizes arguments I made in a little talk for the Excellence in Teaching Initiative launch. (Both the document and slides are available on request from Mark.Grimes@mso.umt.edu.) I have received positive comments from several faculty on this document (and talk), which means that it has been peer reviewed. We don't know, however, to what extent logic and data will influence the people who write and vote on the UFA contract.

Currently, our SEC process is worthless. No good feedback or recommendations is ever generated from this step.

End of the semester IAS forms (student eveluations) have been shown repeatedly to be biased against gender, race and age yet they are emphasized heavily in the faculty evaluation process of 'evidence of teaching success'. I believe UM needs to reconsider the ways we collect student feedback. Student feedback is definitely important, but there are better ways to do so.

Ensure secure access to the files during review.

Even though the students get instructions on what to do and how to fill out forms I end up making a lot of corrections before the documents get sent on.

First, it would help to have electronic access to past student evaluations.

Greater concentration on the specific role of the SEC.

I don't work on campus except for when i teach my class. My class is not in the building of my department and in the evenings. So when I go to pick up my surveys I have to create more time in my schedule to get to the department building before it closes.

I think there also needs to be an overall revision to an electronic system on student feedback from course evaluations- waste of paper, completely inefficient, costly, and delayed feedback fro instructors on course feedback.

I've already answered questions above but new developments suggest that I make additional comments here. The single biggest impediment facing faculty who put effort into adopting student-centered, evidence-based approaches to teaching is the antiquated, fundamentally flawed mechanism to evaluate teaching effectiveness that is mandated in the UFA contract. I propose a two-pronged strategy to improve this situation on campus, which can be called bottom-up and top-down.

Perhaps have students complete the faculty evaluations during classtime.

Pull the course evaluations for each of the courses for each of the faculty being reviewed for the specific number of years under review. Put them in a bin for ease of access for the SEC committee.

Self evaluation and the use of videos provide complementary input for formative and summative evaluation.

Small units need more diverse FEC and SEC.

Substitution of peer review, measurement of learning gains, or other methods to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Peer ratings of teaching performance cover those aspects of teaching that students are not in a position to evaluate.

Teaching evaluation should be improved to reflect the national trend on how to do that.

Teaching evaluations are a notoriously poor and unreliable indicator of curriculum delivery and teaching efficacy. They are biased against females, minorities, and others. They do not measure educational outcomes, but are instead a meaningless measure of popularity. They discourage holding students accountable, and do not promote engaging, creative teaching. Get rid of them and replace with a more robust system. [I say this as someone who consistently receives 'very good' to 'excellent' teaching evaluations in all my courses.]

The FEC struggles with how to incorporate the SEC review. There are lots of issues with the SEC. I do not feel the SEC should be excluded but we need a better way to evaluate faculty's interactions with students. Right now, its only based on their instructional abilities. Faculty interact with students in

various forms, such as serving as the advisor/liason for student organizations, advise research projects, advise/mentor students in their career and academic pursuits,...

The hardest part of the process is getting faculty to submit their student evaluations in time for the SEC to meet.

The SEC chair could share recommendations earlier before the SEC deadline of 15 September.

The SEC is bias and hard to understand what they are reviewing. As of now, its seems the only information the SEC committee receives is the information on bubble sheets used for instruction evaluations. There is a lot more interaction between faculty and students beyond instruction (mentoring professional and academically, research projects, employment) that is not included. Of the three -SEC, FEC, and Chair - the SEC process seems the most inconsistent and bias.

The SEC should be abolished. It is an unstructured survey (not data) evaluated by students who have no skills evaluating surveys.

To motivate evidence-based teaching, we must have evidence-based evaluation of teaching that provides correctly aligned incentives. Student ratings are useful for formative (mid-course) student feedback to help instructors modify their approach. Students ratings are not a sufficient (or even valid) source for summative (end of course) evaluations.

Top-down. The President's and Provost's office can prioritize creation of an anonymized online form that can be used for mid-course feedback and allows one entry per student in a class. This will be useful whether or not the UFA contract is revised. Having this available would allow faculty to use student ratings as mid-course feedback and still satisfy the requirements of our current archaic rules. It should not be technically difficult to implement because we are already using online forms for many things, and online responses can be made available to instructors immediately. The UFA contract doesn't specify what particular form is used, or when it is administered, so this tweak can be pursued right away, I think, to the benefit of the University.

Varies drastically by department: one department it consists essentially of ensuring students have the previous years' evaluations and the faculty observer takes care of the instructional process and then, together, we ensure that the SEC process is complete. Another department handles the entire process with a group of students overseen by a grad TA who knows the process. Another department has the most convoluted of processes that generates what seems to be a very vague student evaluation. The last department I deal with is MCLL and the SEC consists of students from very specific languages.

We need better methods to evaluate teaching. Student ratings are biased against women, people of color, and have no statistical correlation with teaching effectiveness. We should get rid of the student evaluation committee, which only amplifies these biasses.

When peer evaluations are performed, they are more supportive of evidence-based teaching than student evaluations.

While the bottom-up approach is somewhat revolutionary, the top-down approach is evolutionary, and will not be perceived as heavy-handed. The top-down approach does require some bureaucratic judo that those of us on the front lines can't perform.

With an electronic system, the admin would really only be needed to get course reviews for the SEC

Consistency and standardization

Method of submission could be consistent.

The color-coded system works well for me personally (I am very visual) but I know it creates some logistical headaches among other admins (i.e. ordering paper, loading copiers, etc.) . Is it possible to keep the colors if migrating to an electronic system?

A better defined, systematic process of submittal and review across all departments and programs. A consistent format for listing teaching and course evals, service and scholarship

A standard template for IPR creation.

A standardized form would be helpful, for both preparation and review.

An online template for sections of the IPR

An online template that all faculty fill out and submit online would streamline the process and save time from having to "pdf" all the files ourselves.

better template
clear expectations, and consistent format

Currently, the way SEC and FEC write ups are sent to department admins to the point where we send everything to the Dean's office is a done a bit piecemeal and we'd love to see the whole process put onto one standardized online source.

electronic forms that are consistent

Electronic record keeping system with standardized procedures and policies.

Electronic record keeping system.

Follow an electronic template so all are similar in form.

Having a template for an IPR would be helpful - this should include a description of the highlights of the year.

I believe that it should all be done via Moodle or some other online system. I would like to see some consistency in how the information is entered and presented - e.g., create tables/forms for courses. This would save time in creating the IPR and make the FEC process more efficient.

I do believe that a template of sorts with sections where faculty can upload accomplishments in teaching (including evaluations), accomplishments in research (including a list of publications for the review period), and accomplishments in service would be great.

I don't think it is necessary to include all the articles that have been published. Instead, the citation should be sufficient or a link. If there is an online form that we could submit for each section of the IPR, that would be helpful and then if going up for tenure, all the materials could be combined and organized already from the previous years along with the letters from FEC committee, department chair, and dean.

I would just like to once again emphasize that this could all be done online and having it online would make it a much easier process for everyone involved: those going up for review and the committee members doing the review. Example IPRs would also be helpful.

If the University had a standardized approach

If there was an online system, it would be really easy to "track" the IPR and evaluations (i.e. who is working on it and where they are at in the process). The other possible advantage of an online system would be to ensure a uniform "form" for the IPR for each department. Having a system where each department could create an online form (with text areas that would be specific to each department's needs), that the faculty member could fill out, may help the FEC, Dean, and Provost evaluate each IPR more efficiently.

It could be linked to a central database where the activities being reviewed (papers published, papers reviewed, courses taught, etc.) could be stored throughout the year. Then, when evaluation time happens, we could just select the right bits of data and send it off, with the 250-word narrative on top of all of it.

it could be online, and basic info could be saved from year to year. The online form could be a more consistent template across individuals, allowing for a streamlining of the process

More detail of what needs to be included in what order and what format. Maybe a template of a successful IPR. Also there needs to be more advanced notice that these are due.

Our Department IPR form is old and highly outdated. It would be nice if form was electronic.

Putting everything online into a database. Then reports can pull data and standardize the way IPR's are constructed. Right now it's pretty much a free for all for faculty in terms of how they construct these.

Should standardize criteria to be evaluated and eliminate subjective measures.

Standardized formats that can be easily updated year to year. Do NOT make faculty type in information in a bunch of fields on an electronic form every year. There should be a way to upload a standardized format, and then populate an electronic form.

Standardized operation and guidance.

The IPR form itself could be streamlined and standardized

This is a hard question as we are required to document what we do which is very specialized on campus. Because of this we often scan and submit programs and write extensive descriptions about what we do because people outside my school don't really understand what we do. We feel that we can't just list our work because the lists don't necessarily document the impact of the event or the hours put into creating it. Since our creative endeavors are compared not only to our peers in the schools in our college, but also to scientists and business faculty and others across campus, I feel like I need to educate the people reading my file about what I do and what I do can't necessarily be compared to other people's work across campus because we are all doing very different things.   So our submissions are very detailed, descriptive, containing scans of documents and written reports. This all is first created in word and then scanned and uploaded into Moodle. If there was a template where we could write descriptions and have it be online already, then we could submit the paperwork and just scan the other items that are tangible proof of our work.

To have a form we put in the current data.

Use a template where faculty can upload into different sections instead of uploading one long document that is difficult to move between activities, required documents.

We have a standard version of an IPR form that already is very effective.

We need more training - especially for junior faculty. Junior faculty also need access to sample dossiers so they know what to prepare. Finally, there are a lot of inconsistencies in how people report information. It would be nice if it were more consistent across faculty.

Administrative support for FE process

I do not micromanage this stage of the process, and my understanding is that my departmental admins do not feel like they have the right to nag about meeting the deadline. I do what I can once I learn something is amiss, but I often don't hear about it until it is too late.

3. Seeing the department admins treated like servants. This is the evaluation process for faculty - they need to be put in control of their own evaluation. The faculty don't hold the hands of staff people when we're being evaluated, why should we hold their hands?!

A central repository of all documents in the administrative assistant's office with a check list on the top with a place for the faculty member to sign either approving or claiming the right ot rebut the conclusions.

Again, we use a Box-based workflow, but then also rely on paper documents. Personally I'd prefer an all electronic workflow but unsure whether some faculty, or our admin, could figure that out- people don't read emails, know how to add signatures to pdfs, etc.

Automate the process with a few simple web forms to generate the paperwork. The department admin sinks an unbelievable amount of time into copy-and-paste work to populate the forms with the FEC and FEC chairs review and recommendation. Just make sure that whatever system you eventually select is

sufficiently flexible to accommodate the full diversity of faculty work, IPR content. It will be unacceptable and a step backwards if you choose a product that limits the FEC process because it lacks the flexibility to handle the diversity of activity and products.

CC departmental admins (or get me the info somehow), so that I can file away the letters for when the faculty ask to see them next year.

Copying the information from the SEC, FEC and CE onto the appropriate forms and getting them signed. Ensuring that the appropriate copies of past reviews are in the file before it goes to the deans office.

Currently, faculty stop by their admin's desk to review & physically sign. I do not know that switching to an electronic signature system (i.e. DocuSign) would be beneficial/more efficient. Setting up an electronic system with specific permissions for each document for each faculty member seems extremely work-intensive.

Do I say this again? Faculty MUST be responsible for their own careers. This is a process whereby faculty receive promotions, tenure and/or merit and other than providing support in the form of completing the various evaluation forms, staff should not be expected to do anything more than that. I should not be responsible for hunt down past evaluation forms nor even to ensure that a faculty member's submission is complete.   I hazard a guess that if a student handed in an incomplete project, which determines their grade and even whether they graduate, very few faculty would think it was their responsibility to complete the project on the student's behalf. That's what the administration and faculty expect of staff. Please look at this process as if the faculty member is a student and place the same expectations faculty have of their students upon the faculty, throughout their career on campus, for the faculty evaluation process

FER, SEC, FEC, CE ensuring that the data is correct. Looking through files and HR sites to determine correct dates, and levels for each faculty.

have an online process that could be monitored by Dean's Assistant/Office Staff, reminders/prompts to keep the approval and signature process moving forward

However, I always meet my deadline and submit my reports to the Dean by the posted deadline.The administrative associate is very helpful in keeping track of who has or has not signed reports.

I fill out the Faculty Evaluation Records (white sheet), Dean's Recommendation (blue sheet), prepare a spreadsheet summarizing all faculty member requests and recommendations from the FEC and Chairs, prepare a spreadsheet summarizing merit rankings, and review submitted files from Departments for accuracy.

I have 3-departments and all three seem to do the process the same, yet slightly different

I start off by creating an action sheet for myself, so I know who is up for what and what years they are being reviewed for. I filled out all the forms myself.   I had the chairs of the commettee's send me their recommendations and then I plugged them into the correct form and printed them on the correct color of paper. Once finished I tracked down all the signatures that were required.

I was FEC chair this year. The preparation of paper voting forms was done by a staff member new to our unit, and many mistakes were made (who could vote on what, what was being voted on). Because

this is very different department to department -- as far as who votes on what -- it can be error-prone. As FEC chair, it is a good thing they were on paper for me to review so I could catch the mistakes the staff person made.

In a perfect world, I would have the time to get recommendations from the Dean out to faculty well in advance of the deadline, so that if there is going to be an appeal, or if there are questions, we can address them before sending materials to the Provost. Unfortunately, we just do not have the human capital to be able to delegate the other tasks on my plate in order to prioritize this earlier; plus, the Dean is not always prompt with his summaries.

In the past when the department had it's own admin assoc they provided the FEC with a lot of assistance. This is no longer possible since the admin has 4 departments to deal with. The burden is transferred to faculty and the FEC.

IPRs are submitted to our admin person, who then uploads them to Box, but because of competence issues on the part of the admin person, documents are often missing and chair (me) spends a lot of time making sure files are complete. It's clunky.

It is essential that those responsible for the faculty evaluation process -- the UFA and the Provost's Office -- make it clear to faculty from their first year and remind faculty EVERY YEAR that their IPR is their responsibility. At no point on this campus since 2002 has it ever been made clear to faculty that their IPR determines their raise/promotion/tenure/merit and that it's their responsibility to ensure they have and retain every colored copy of their evaluations from their first year. It is not my job to ensure that they get a raise, promotion or tenure.

It is their pay and promotion. If they don't feel it is necessary to complete the process then it is not my concern. It is part of their CBA to do the appropriate review of their work.

It seems that some of the faculty either don't read the directions well, or expect the admin. to complete the IPR packet with the necessary previous reviews

Make the entire process online. Even though I send out the signed letters to faculty, every year I have to pull together past letters for them. If the process was online and housed the letters, it would save me a great deal of time, as the faculty member could locate past letters themselves.

More administrative support. We have been without administrative support for the last two IPR cycles and all faculty has been individually responsible for completing and submitting IPR's directly through Moodle or to the Department chair. Administrative support should be onboarded soon, but with a university wide submittal system and consistent process on review it might be easier to provide greater centralized support

More responsibility for the FEC chair and less responsibility put on staff.

Our admin has been very helpful, although staffing reorganization has resulted in one admin assuming responsibility for the process across multiple departments and programs.

Program coordinators could receive better training on the IPR process in order to better facilitate communication of deadlines, process of preparing the IPR for the faculty being evaluated, and printing and recording of documentation when prepared.

reduce the workload for the admin. person that has to put them all together.

Staff can play a role in completing online forms or organizing the structure each year and then the faculty can independently login and complete upload what's needed. And then we can, of course, check in throughout the process and send reminders, point out missing materials, etc.

The administrative associate keeps track of these signatures so that we meet the deadline for the dean.

The department admin does a bunch of unnecessary formatting and paper shuffling. What really seems insane is that we all submit IPRs electronically, then these are printed, signed, scanned, and the process repeated with the FEC, Chair and Dean evaluations. Bring us out of the dark ages.

The paper forms are cumbersome and take a long time to process. The best way to make review more efficient would be to switch to an online system. Entering the information by hand from the paper copies also creates more space for human error, which can be time consuming to correct and frustrating for faculty. Generating the letters/emails is also quite time consuming and again opens up the possibility for some errors.

The process needs to be explained to chairs as well as faculty so that the appropriate copies remain in a department. I have had two chairs who kept their chair evaluations rather than filing one copy in the department file, consequently there are faculty evaluation files that are missing several years of signed chair evaluations. I can still reproduce an unsigned copy but all signed copies are missing.

There should be one place to submit all materials. We should be able to change the permissions on the files as it goes up through the ranks. Right now the process is the worst for our admins.

Until this year, the administrative assistant coordinated documents depending on the status (rank, increment requested) of the faculty member. Loss of staff affected that, and appropriate documents were not compiled.

We have had problems with IPRs submission sections becoming mixed even when faculty labels and submits in the correct order (this happened to three faculty last year).

We print four copies of the Dean's recommendation: one for our college's files, one for the packet that goes to the Provost, one for the faculty member, and one for the department. We put all of the department ones in a packet for the Chair (who is then supposed to put them in their department's files, but that doesn't usually happen unless an admin gets them from the Chair). We put each individual faculty member's recommendation in an envelope and deliver it to the department to then put in their mailboxes.

We upload all our materials to a UM Box page. It is easy because our admin staff does all the hard work. So... anything to make our admins life easier I am in favor of :-)